DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 825 CS 503 538

AUTHOR Balthrop, Bill, Ed.
TITLE Speaker and Gavel. Volume 17, Number 2.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 60p.
JOURNAL CIT Speaker and Gavel; v17 n2 Win 1980

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Debate; *Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Persuasive Discourse; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Forensics

ABSTRACT

The 14 articles in this journal issue focus on the role of forensics in the eighties. Among the topics discussed in the articles are the following: (1) the survival of forensics, (2) intercollegiate debate, (3) accountability, and (4) intercollegiate forensics. In addition, several articles provide predictions and projections for the future of forensics. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204825

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SPEAKER AND GAVEL

volume 17, number 2 winter, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bill Balthrop

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503538

speaker and gavel

A Prospective: Forensics in the Eighties—James A. Benson ... 69

The Survival of Forensics in a Time of Crisis—Sidney R. Hill, Jr. .. 72

Forensics in the 1980's—Predictions and Projections—Jack H. Howe 76

Intercollegiate Debate in the 1980's—A Guess—Thomas J. Hynes, Jr. 79

Policy Fiat: Theoretical Battleground of the Eighties—Thomas Isaacson and Robert Branham 84

Forensics in the Eighties: You Can Never Find an Oracle When You Need Her—Anita C. James 92

Forensics in the Eighties—Kassian A. Kovalcheck 97

Debate in the Eighties: Charting a Course—Allan D. Louden ... 100

Intercollegiate Debate: Proposals for a Struggling Activity—John T. Morello. 103

The 1980's: A Watershed Decade—Michael Pfau 108

Forensics in the Eighties—James W. Pratt and Larry G. Schnoor .. 111

Going Public: Accountability in the 1980's—Robert O. Weiss 114

Intercollegiate Forensics in the 1980's: A Brief Look into a Murky Crystal Ball—Tennyson Williams 117

Forensics in the Eighties: Challenges and Prospects—David Zarefsky 119

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 2 WINTER, 1980

speaker and gavel

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

Second-class postage paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66044
Issued quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DSR-TKA

President: JACK HOWE, California State University, Long Beach
Vice President: DAVID A. THOMAS, Auburn University
Secretary: BERTRAM W. GROSS, Marshall University
Treasurer: ELAINE BRUGGEMEIER, Loyola University
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College; JAMES J. HALL, St. John's University; HALFORD RYAN, Washington and Lee College; KASSIAN KOVALCHEK, Vanderbilt University; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; DONN W. PARSON, University of Kansas; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State University; WAYNE CALLAWAY, University of Wyoming; JOHN DeBROSS, University of Southern California.

Members at Large: TOM KANE (Past President), University of Pittsburgh; JAMES A. JOHNSON, The Colorado College; MICHAEL M. OVERKING, Fairmont State College.

ACHS Representative: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California.

Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: JOHN GREG, St. John's University.

EDITORIAL BOARD

ROBERT J. BRANHAM, Bates College; SKIP COULTER, Samford University; JOAN DONOVAN, St. Lawrence University; G. THOMAS GOODNIGHT, Northwestern University; SIDNEY R. HILL, JR., Mississippi State University; THOMAS J. HYNES, University of Louisville; ANITA JAMES, Ohio University; JAMES A. JOHNSON, The Colorado College; CHARLES KAUFFMAN, University of Virginia; LUCY KEELE, California State University, Fullerton; JAMES KLUMPP, University of Nebraska; JOHN T. MORELLO, James Madison University; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State University; JOHN SCHUNK, Wichita State University; BARBARA WARNICK, Tulane University; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University; MARILYN YOUNG, Florida State University.

EDITOR

BILL BALTHROP, 115 Bingham Hall, 007A, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514.

speaker and gavel

Volume 17 Winter 1980 No. 2

A PROSPECTIVE: FORENSICS IN THE EIGHTIES

JAMES A. BENSON

I believe firmly that the 1980's will challenge the resourcefulness of directors of forensics in ways which we have not faced in recent years. I also believe that, through careful planning and adaptation now, the activity can be equal to the challenge.

The first main challenge is going to be budgeting. Overcoming this obstacle will demand some revamping of our thinking and some innovative action.

For most of us, the days of constantly-increasing budgets and of expanding programs are over—at least for the next few years. Inflation has already made past budget increases illusory for many and the rate of inflation does not seem likely to abate. Total university budgets are expected to be strained by significant declines in the number of students[1] and attempts to generate additional revenues by increasing tuition may discourage even more students from attending.[2]

Now is obviously the time for most of us to begin planning ways to stretch budget dollars. There are several options available to do this. One is to shorten the length of tournaments. If Friday–Sunday tournaments were cut back to Friday–Saturday—some to Saturday only—we could eliminate tremendous housing and food costs. In debate, this might be accomplished by curtailing the number of preliminary rounds to five or six and beginning elimination rounds at semis, unless there were over forty teams. Enforced preparation time and elimination of delays (coaching?) between rounds could allow scheduling up to six rounds of debate a day.

In individual events, a format with two preliminary rounds and finals has allowed East Coast schools to run one-day tournaments for several years. Curtailing the number of events a student could enter would make it pos-

---

James A. Benson is Professor and former Director of Forensics, Department of Speech and Theatre, Ball State University.

[1] The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education report, *Three Thousand Futures: The Next 20 Years in Higher Education*, estimates that undergraduate enrollment in U.S. colleges and universities will probably decline by five to fifteen percent between 1980 and 2000 ("College in 2000: Is less more?" *"Science News*, Jan. 26, 1980, p. 55); the Census Bureau estimates that the number of 18-year-olds in the United States will decline nineteen percent over the next ten years (Allan Ostar, President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Feb. 1, 1980, p. 243.)

[2] A study by the Stanford Research Institute found that every $100 decline in tuition will increase enrollment more than one percent among students from families earning more than $12,000 a year, and more than seven percent among students from families earning less than $6,000 a year. (Allan Ostar, President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Feb. 1, 1980, p. 245.)

sible to group events and facilitate a one-day tournament. Especially with individual events (because of the large number of students involved), saving one night's lodging and one day's food could stretch the budget substantially.

Another way to save money is to curtail awards. While the gleaming hardware for team and individual awards is impressive, it is a frill with which we could afford to dispense. Both entry fees and tournament administration costs could be significantly reduced by eliminating or curtailing these awards through fewer trophies or by replacing them with certificates or book awards.

Elimination of the coaches' party and/or the tournament banquet would be yet another way to facilitate reduced—or eliminated—entry fees.

Coaches can facilitate such change by a simple computation of what they get for their tournament dollar. For example, if you run a tournament which gives trophies to the top teams and serves coffee and a snack on the mornings of the tournament, you *know* it doesn't cost $50 per team to do this. Stop paying such a ridiculous fee.

Our nationals, too, could be shortened to become 2–3 day tournaments. This might mean regrouping of events, fewer preliminary rounds, or a tighter schedule. A change, yes—but it could be done.

A final manner in which to cope with funding problems would be to launch a national campaign to obtain business, philanthropic or government funding for our nationals. Attending nationals is already a financial impossibility for some schools and, on the scale many of us do it now, a luxury we won't be able to afford for long. The creativity demonstrated by students in competition suggests to me that they and their coaches possess the talent to devise a successful persuasive pitch—we simply need to tap our available talent.

Declining numbers of student participants and curtailed participation by students on forensics teams is the second challenge I perceive. Declining participation will result from fewer students, from fewer scholarships as university revenues decrease or become more scarce, and from more part-time work by students to defray rising costs of education. Each factor spells decreased participation in forensic activities.

There are several methods by which to adapt to this challenge. One is a curtailed tournament schedule. Chances are that the typical student can participate—and profit from tournament activity—less frequently than we assume. Speaking before local groups as part of a speaker's bureau, before speech classes, participating in campus debates, or on-the-job speech experiences through an internship might all be challenging—yet less time-consuming—substitutes for tournament travel. A curtailed tournament calendar might necessitate revision of our thinking regarding qualification methods for national tournaments.

Another adjustment which the constraints of the Eighties will introduce is that competition will increasingly become regional, rather than national. For this reason, it's important that each Director of Forensics do whatever is possible to assure a healthy region, in terms of schools which sponsor programs. If your region is stagnating or dying in terms of forensic programs, *now* is the time to ask "why" and "what can I do?"

In many areas of the country, the league concept, which sponsors low-cost, one-day tournaments, has provided a means for fledgling programs and programs with limited budgets to survive. State speech organizations or regional groupings of schools should investigate this means of assisting the new and the low-budget program.

A curtailing of the coaching staffs in larger programs is one more ad-

justment the Eighties is likely to generate. As tight fiscal policies and accountability influence university planning, I believe we will experience pressures to curtail released time for coaching and absences from classes to attend tournaments with the team. It will be easier to justify teaching 25 students in a class than to coach and travel with 10–15 students in speech activities. Such pressure will increase if faculty realize that publication and committee work is more essential to job security—tenure and promotion—than is working with an activity.

One important preparation for coping with this type of pressure is to begin sorely-needed empirical investigation to verify the claims we make for speech activities. For example, does debating really improve one's analytical abilities; will competition in extemporaneous speaking enhance one's ability to retrieve information or to organize; do those who debate make significant improvements in rational thinking, cogent statement of arguments or delivery; what does a student gain—in terms of measurable abilities—from participating in oral interpretation or persuasive speaking?

A second method of combatting this type of pressure is to consider substitutes for the traditional types of coaching. The student in persuasion, for example, might profit from first-hand experience in persuasive campaigns for local organizations like the hospital auxiliary or a local business enterprise. Expertise gained on-the-job or through internship experiences could be transferred to a tournament setting. Oral interpreters might learn from participation in local drama groups, service clubs which recreate literature for children, or institutionalized groups and transfer this learning to the tournament round. A cadre system—having experienced students assist with the coaching of the novices—might be a viable solution, too.

A final challenge I will mention is that of working with incoming students who may be less competent and less "turned on" to the rigors of tournament competition. As Alexander Astin, professor of higher education, UCLA, and president, Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles, describes the situation,

> A more subtle interpretation is that declining competence levels and declining college attendance rates are manifestations of a common underlying condition: students are becoming less committed to, and less turned on by, the academic experience in general—less attracted to activities that involve reading, writing, memorizing, debating, abstracting, critical thinking, and intellectual exploration. This avoidance of things intellectual and academic is, of course, closely tied in with the students' *feelings* of competence: students will tend to avoid things they feel are too difficult or that they cannot master or comprehend, regardless of what grades their teachers might give them .... Students, in other words, are not being fooled by their high grades ....[3]

Astin's suggested remedies might prove fruitful for each of us: ask students to invest more of themselves in education; demand more academic studies in degree programs; increase homework assignments; decrease passive learning; and use competency examinations.[4]

One thing appears certain to this observer: the challenges of the Eighties will be significant. However, the methods to confront these challenges also appear to be ample. Planning now, to determine the best methods of adjusting, seems to be paramount to preserving a vibrant activity. Let us hope we are up to the challenges of the 1980's.

---

[3] Alexander W. Astin, "College Enrollment: The Need for Bold Solutions," *Publisher's Weekly*, Oct. 29, 1979, p. 55.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

THE SURVIVAL OF FORENSICS IN A TIME OF CRISIS

SIDNEY R. HILL, JR.

There is something faintly arrogant about writing an essay such as this. Perhaps it is the assumption that one is sufficiently perceptive to foresee accurately the coming decade. At the same time, the assignment is a bit scary. After all, one is committing guesses to paper. When another editor a decade hence looks back at the predictions we offer here, how hard will he or she laugh? There is a temptation to take refuge in a series of very detailed predictions à la Jean Dixon. If the list is long enough, surely some of them will come true. These can be clutched as ego insurance, while the others are quickly consigned to the dust bin. It is in this spirit that the following are offered.

(1) At some point in the decade, the average rate of speaking for 1-AR's will cross six hundred w.p.m.
(2) The number of individuals on a standard debate team will be increased to three; two will talk and the other will help carry evidence.
(3) Decathalon (i.e., best score in ten events) will replace pentathalon as the standard I.E. combo award.

In a more serious vein, there are forces at work which most likely mean that the debate and individual events programs which we know today will be radically different ten years from now. Some of those forces are internal, and others are really external to forensics. They are the causes which must be understood if we are to have any chance of prediction.

The philosophy of some coaches and a few institutions notwithstanding, most of the profession defines debate as an educational activity. We certainly all operate within educational institutions. As such, there is no way for forensics to avoid the impact of some very solidly-based predictions facing higher education as a whole. The total number of students attending college in the Eighties is going to decline. This will mean a loss of direct revenues from tuition and a decline in government revenues which are tied to enrollment. It is not impossible that financial support for higher education will actually decline, at least in terms of real dollars. At the same time that revenues are slowing down, the expenses which all colleges face are growing rapidly. Utility costs are one example—energy is just as expensive for the college as it is for the homeowner. Electricity bills alone of over $125,000 a month are not unusual. Wages for support staff and faculty salaries are growing faster than revenues. The end result of all of this is a financial squeeze. The funding problem (it might be called a crisis) is real, and it is nationwide.

Educational administrators are not magicians—they are not going to be able to pull money out of the air. That means that almost every college is going to be forced to reduce or perhaps eliminate some programs. The degree to which these pressures will directly affect forensics programs is hard to predict. In those institutions where a solid base of support exists for forensics, chances are that the programs will survive. It seems likely

Sidney R. Hill, Jr. is Director of Forensics and Associate Professor of Communication at Mississippi State University.

that the most crucial support group will be among our departmental colleagues. In those institutions where forensics is well-integrated into the overall academic program, and where our fellow faculty members understand and support the goals of forensic training, the future looks fairly bright. There are institutions where this is not the case. There are departments where forensics programs exist on sufferance, and there are institutions where the forensics program has totally lost a departmental affiliation. In these cases, the Eighties may not be a pleasant experience. Administrative support, based either on a memory (by Dean, Veep, or President) of his or her own undergraduate debate experience or on a personal relationship with the debate coach, is notoriously fickle. More and more states are moving toward increased oversight of higher education by off-campus agencies. This trend most likely will continue into the Eighties and it is naive to expect that forensics programs will not be affected.

In predicting the effect of financial exigencies on forensics, we might divide existing programs into three groups. One of these consists of a small number of programs whose funding is independent of the revenues of the institution of which they are a part. Some of these enjoy endowments; others receive regular donations from alumni or well-to-do "friends" of the program. Although this group will experience some of the financial difficulties caused by the increase in travel expenses, in general they will continue to operate as they have in the past. Their secured funding provides insurance against pressures to make major adjustments.

A second group of programs consists of those where tournament competition is not the central focus of forensics. These operate in a variety of settings, but all share two characteristics. They involve relatively large numbers of students and they expend relatively small amounts of money in off-campus activities. Campus debates and forums, legislative assemblies, public advocacy programs, etc. are among the sorts of events in which these programs are involved. This second group also may be expected to continue into the Eighties with little structural change. Their security is provided by a lesser dependence on funding to achieve their educational objectives.

The third and last group comprises the vast bulk of intercollegiate forensics programs now operating. Although differing widely in the philosophy of the coaching personnel, the nature of the educational institution at which they are housed, and the success which students experience while involved, these programs share one dominant trait. The core, the central focus, of the forensics experience is the competitive tournament. In some cases, that competitive focus is on the varsity debate team. In others, it is on an individual events squad. In either case, these programs may expect significant changes in the coming decade. The funding problems of higher education make it increasingly unlikely that institutions will continue to be willing to spend thousands of dollars supporting the travel of six to eight students.

For this third group, the Eighties will be a decade of change. Different schools will react in different ways, but two fairly obvious predictions stand out.

(1) The number of tournaments which make up a squad's travel season is going to decrease. Even with deregulation of air fares, the basic mode of transportation for the overwhelming majority of debate teams remains the car or van. The cost of automotive travel goes up almost monthly. If we assume that the availability of gasoline doesn't become a problem, we

cannot ignore the impact of rising prices. For many forensics programs, a 50% increase in the price of gas translates into an effective 50% cut in the debate budget.

(2) The number of assistant debate coaches is going to decline. There is a well-publicized glut in the academic job market. As a result, the number of students entering graduate school each year is no longer increasing as it did in the Sixties and Seventies. Many institutions already acknowledge that they are experiencing difficulty in filling graduate assistantships. Graduate degree-granting institutions frequently depend on teaching assistants to staff their basic courses. They will be less likely to assign one of those assistants to work with forensics if it means that a basic course section must go untaught.

High school debate coaches for many years have had to worry about financing their travel programs. Many of them are quite familiar with fundraising schemes, and it is likely that at least some college coaches will have to learn from them. The scramble for dollars isn't a great deal of fun, but when the choices are limited to raising money or closing down the program coaches may find that their own values shift a bit. While there is nothing inherently wrong with seeking to raise outside money to support a forensics program, there are some dangers of which we should be aware.

It seems most unfortunate to shift the main financial burden to the students themselves. In many instances, that would mean effectively denying an opportunity to participate to many students. This is not just a problem for the traditional minority groups. There are many white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant males who are already feeling the pinch of rising tuitions, more costly books, higher rent, etc. These costs are not going to stabilize in the Eighties. They are going to continue to go up just like all the other costs in higher education. To allow forensics to degenerate into an activity where only the relatively well-to-do can participate would destroy a basic justification for its existence. Scholarships are not a realistic answer. If the institution has the money to support a program, then scholarships are a useful recruiting device. But if the basic funding of the program is in danger, it is absurd to expect that money will be forthcoming for forensics scholarships.

Some institutions have long relied on financing from student activity fees. Others have begun to look that way in recent years. This seems to be a potential trap. First, student fees must support a wide range of activities. All of these will be needing more money. The general financial squeeze makes it unlikely that any great untapped pool exists to devote to the support of forensics. Perhaps even more importantly, student financing is inherently unstable. Even the most diplomatic debate coach can do little when a campus "reform" group sweeps into office determined to change things. Students, as is true of faculty/administrative groups, sometimes like to change things simply for the sake of saying they changed something. It is a way of having an impact, and that is a tempting goal. Pity the poor forensics director whose budget gets "changed" along with everything else. There are certainly forensics programs whose directors have played the student politics game successfully for many years. It is always possible to secure student support for projects on a short-term basis. Yet the instability is also there, and it seems to be a dangerous path to follow. There are times, and institutions, where it may be necessary for survival. As a widespread solution, however, the dangers seem to outweigh any temporary advantages.

So far this paper has focused on changes which we may expect from

forces essentially external to the forensics program. There will most likely be other changes resulting from internal forces. Some trends which began in the Seventies clearly are in tune with the interests of contemporary college students and will flourish in the coming decade. Individual events competition will continue to burgeon in all directions. More students will be attracted to I.E. contests as these provide an outlet for competitive urges while maintaining a reasonable balance between effort needed and reward received. The total number of different events undoubtedly will increase as well. Even if some of those now found (e.g. original poetry interp) mercifully die off, tournament directors will continue to invent new forms. It is, after all, an interesting diversion and does provide an excuse to give away another set of trophies. Moreover, there is always the chance of striking an unsuspected pool of interest and going down in forensics history as the Founding Father of Impromptu Rhet. Crit.

CEDA-study debate may be expected to grow, both as a vehicle for exposing true novices (i.e., not high school hot-shots) to the debate process and as an inherently valuable event. Given the competitive instincts of debate coaches, CEDA most likely will spend the coming decade in a series of squabbles over exactly what "the CEDA philosophy" means. A great deal of energy will be expended in the effort to maintain a distinction between CEDA and NDT-style debating. Those efforts may or may not be successful.

There is no reason not to expect that the Eighties will bring changes to the practice of forensics. Every other decade certainly has. Only a few of them have been discussed here. Some of the changes will be subtle, and years will pass before their full impact is recognized. Others will be more drastic and immediate in their effect. Some of the changes will be good for the discipline, and some—we hope not many—will be bad. Some of the things that we greet joyfully as major advances will turn out not to be so beneficial as we anticipated. Fortunately, some of the things we view with such alarm will produce completely unexpected advantages.

There is one final prediction of which this author is completely confident. The Eighties will see the publication of a number of essays arguing that the whole field is "going to hell in a handbasket." That is not so. There is an inherent vitality in the process of learning how to deal rationally with problems which seems to defy any of our attempts to kill it off.

FORENSICS IN THE 1980'S—PREDICTIONS AND PROJECTIONS

JACK H. HOWE

To predict accurately the direction that forensics will take in the 1980's would require a crystal ball. So much for predictions. Projections, however, are extensions of contemporary conditions and, as such, at least have a springboard before they leap untrammeled into space. This prognostication will attempt to rely far more on projections than on predictions, and on a consolidation of advances already made.

In a previous article in *Speaker and Gavel*, the author noted that the 1970's was an explosive decade for forensics. The 1980's should, therefore, witness a deacceleration in the process of change.

At the opening of the 1970's, more than half the intercollegiate forensic tournaments in the United States were strictly debate tournaments.[1] By the opening of the 1980's, the three types of tournaments (debate only, speech—combining debate and individual events, and individual events only) were divided nearly evenly—33.4% debate, 36.9% speech, and 29.7% individual events.[2] Projecting from this and the fact that the growth of individual events tournaments and the decline of debate tournaments has slowed markedly in the last few years, the author asserts that the three types of tournaments will remain in relative balance during the 1980's with each accounting for approximately a third of all tournament activity. As a concomitant of this, he predicts that the few schools remaining that have ignored individual events programs and clung solely to debate programs will be obliged to expand into the area of individual events competition.

Individual events activity, as implied in the above paragraph, should continue to occupy a major portion of the forensic scene in the 1980's, and perhaps become dominant if not so already. The missionary zeal of the converts to individual events that characterized the 1970's should fade somewhat during the 1980's. With that process, perhaps the tendency to extreme proliferation of events at tournaments will be curbed. Within the individual events picture, there may be a tendency toward events requiring less individual preparation as our students generally resist activities that call for more of their time.

Debate on its part should experience continued experimentation during the 1980's. One anticipates both continued growth for the Cross-Examination Debate Association which should be able to establish itself firmly in the northeast during this decade, and also for individual debate whether that form is using the CEDA topic or some other one. In fact the use of multi-topics by debaters should greatly expand during this decade. CEDA is inaugurating the decade by returning to a system in force from 1972 to

---

Jack H. Howe is a Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at California State University at Long Beach. He is the current President of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

[1] For the year 1969–70, 53.7% of all collegiate tournaments offered only debate. Jack H. Howe, *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results*, IX (1969–70), p. 85.

[2] Jack H. Howe, *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results*, XIX (1979–80), p. 96.

1975 whereby two topics would be used each year. Experimentation along multi-topic lines is now occurring in Washington state. It is not unlikely that by the end of this decade, debaters will normally deal with two or three or as many as six topics in the course of a debate season.

Barring an end to inflation and declining school enrollments, two items about which the author's crystal ball is murky, tournaments in the 1980's will surely change from those known in previous decades. A tendency was noted during the last three years of the 1970's for tournaments to attract both fewer schools and fewer actual participants than formerly. There is no reason to expect this trend not to continue, as it would appear to be based essentially on declining forensic budgets and increased tournament costs, two millstones between which even the most prosperous forensics director must ultimately be crushed. The author predicts two results from this situation. First, there will be a slight tendency toward three-day tournaments (as opposed to the two-day meet that is standard now). This prediction is based on the assumption that forensics directors will feel that if they are going to considerable travel expense in attending a distant tournament, then it should be a "good" one involving both debate and individual events and numerous preliminary and elimination rounds of each. Second, there will be a tendency back to the one-day tournament found in the earliest days of tournament activity. The author expects to see far more done by city or metropolitan-area leagues, such as the Twin Cities Forensic League now operating so successfully in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, during the 1980's than formerly. Such leagues, operating a series of one-day tournaments for member schools located no more than 100 miles from a tournament site, could obviate lodging bills, curtail food expenses, and limit transportation costs to manageable figures, while still providing a substantial amount of forensic competition.

A vital aspect of the tournament process is judging of events. And, of course, complaints about judging are not new to forensics. The author is sure that when debates were held in the schools of Athens or in medieval universities, debaters complained that some judges did not keep adequate "flow-papyri" or "flow-slates." The California high schools have sought to attack this problem currently from an unusual direction by forbidding the keeping of flow-sheets at all, thereby forcing the debaters to communicate clearly enough and summarize often enough so that the judge can retain what he is hearing. It is unlikely, however, that this system will find favor in the college circuit. The major complaints the author has heard in recent years about judging has centered not on debate, but rather in individual events, which is understandable enough, as they have more recently leapt into prominence. The gist of the complaints would seem to lie, also, not so much with allegations of incompetence on the part of judges (certainly the chief complaint of debaters about *their* judges), but rather on the lack of universal standards on which judgment can be based. The oral interpreter with an emotion-charged program which he or she projects physically as well as orally will receive first place in some parts of the country, last place in others. The California expositor with his or her visual aids and humor-studded speech will find heavy going in the east. Even the impromptu speaker who does so well in his own area may be nonplussed by the topics he draws at a distant tournament. While the author suspects it will be impossible really to standardize judging so long as judges are human (and he thoroughly anticipates, but not in this next decade, a mechanical judging machine that will dispose of the human factor), it does seem likely that attempts will be made during the 1980's to produce in writing national

standards for all individual events. Either the NFA or the AFA will take the lead in doing this (and the other organization will rapidly follow with its own standards). The mere production of national judging standards will certainly not solve the problem (any more than the creation of a code of ethics for debate in the 1970's solved ethical problems in that area), but conscientious judges will at least be given a guideline that will transcend the preferences of their local areas.

As a final note, the author will advance a "prediction" that is probably more of a wish on his part than anything else. Hopefully, during the 1980's, the articles that are being accepted for the journals that deal with forensics will witness a return to those of a more practical nature that have ready utility in the work forensics directors are doing. Our generation of speech educators has mutely followed the lead of government bureaucrats and pseudo-scientists in equating the obscure with the impressive, the undecipherable with the significant, and the verbose with the valuable. It may well take some new periodical, perhaps called *Practical Forensics*, to reveal a need for the easily understood article from which the reader may derive immediate benefit. But whatever it requires, the author hopes that the 1980's will not pass without such a movement's being undertaken.

The 1980's can be an exciting time for forensics in the United States. Hopefully, in the midst of the excitement, we, as directors of the activity, will not forget that our students engage in forensics not just for enjoyment and competition, but also for values that will remain with them for the rest of their lives.

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE IN THE 1980'S—A GUESS

THOMAS J. HYNES, JR.

The title of this essay reflects the trepidation with which I approach this task. My own feelings were well expressed by John McIntire in an essay called "The Prospects for Conflict."

> Few intellectual endeavors are more fraught with hazard than those of the 'futurist'. One would assume that the hazards of peering into the future are so well known as to discourage all but the stout heart or those so institutionally faceless as to be insulated from the righteous protest of contemporaries who have been persuaded to carry umbrellas on a rainy day.[1]

I will partition this essay into three sections: debate and educational administration; debate and debate tournaments; debate and debate coaching. At the beginning of this discussion, I should warn that some of my projections will imply fear of an end to debate as I know it. In addition, there will be some suggestion that such changes will be less satisfying to me than the present condition of academic debate. I hope that these will not effect this essay too greatly. Many of those things which I played some small part creating during the 1970's will be changed in the 1980's. Most likely, such changes will be consistent with changes in education at large during the '80's. Much of this evolution will undoubtedly be good. Such alterations would be resisted because change is often risky—and risk is often unpleasant for those who succeed under the existing order. I believe that the framework for these changes will have some of the following characteristics.

Debate and Educational Administration

Recent demographic projections suggest changes in the composition of college and university populations during the next ten years. Such projections suggest that many colleges and universities will serve fewer students than they did in the '60's and '70's; and that the demographic characteristics of these students will be different from those of colleges and universities of earlier years. While the majority of students will remain 18–21 year olds, the proportion of older students pursuing a college education for reasons rooted in a desire for personal enrichment will increase. The composition of debate programs may be forced to change.

At the same time, the willingness of the public—both for state and private supported colleges and universities—to provide continued high levels of financial support to debate appears to have been tempered. In the face of projections that the days of constant economic growth have ended, privately contributors as well as the voting public are contributing less to higher education than they did in the past. Gov. John Y. Brown of Kentucky, for example, in the face of declining revenues, called for financial cutbacks throughout the state university system. This reflects an environment that

---

Thomas J. Hynes, Jr. is Assistant Professor of Theatre Arts and Speech and Director of Debate at the University of Louisville.

[1] John J. McIntire, "The Prospects For Conflict," in *The Future of Conflict* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1979), p. 31.

began in the 1970's and will more than likely continue through the 1980's. One of my colleagues has gone as far as to say that we have reached and passed the apex of American Education. Whether this is the case, it seems likely that the 1980's will bring increasing calls for programmatic justification and accountability in higher education.

Debate could equally well prosper or suffer greatly in such an environment. As has been the case with debate programs before, that fate may well be determined by the interaction between forensics director and university administrators. While there may be some fundamental changes in the debate activity during the next decade, the prospects of making competitive debate a large participation activity is unlikely.[2] If the director is unable to sell, or the administrator unable to accept, the premise that substantial per person expenditures are justified, then debate is likely to face severe retrenchment.

Given these situations, I believe that there will be increasing demands upon the forensics director to be all things to all people. To satisfy the demands for promotion and tenure, he/she will be required to spend increasing time on research and publication. To satisfy the competitive rigors of the debate activity, he/she will continue to spend many hours becoming familiar with materials on the current debate topic. Classroom responsibilities and the associated preparations will continue. At the same time, there will be pressures to sell the debate program to the academic community as something which provides a valued service to that community. All of these things have been true in the past. I believe, however, the demands of the 1980's will be far greater than those previously experienced. How individual directors, as well as professional organizations deal with these issues, and how the case for debate is made to university administrators will in large part determine the continued survival of debate in the 1980's.

Debate may look very differently in the 1980's than it has looked in the 1970's. The appearance of the debate tournament as the central feature of academic debate may well have reached its height in the 1970's. This will be the topic of the second section of this essay.

Debate and Debate Tournaments

The 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's saw the development of the debate tournament as a method to stretch debate budgets. Rather than spend large amounts of money on a few trips for only a few debates, the debate tournament became a method for having a large number of debates for a single trip. During the 1970's, the debate tournament was institutionalized as the expected form of intercollegiate debate. Literally hundreds of participants would descend upon a single college campus for a weekend of anywhere from six to twelve debates for an individual team. Moreover, the beginning of the 1970's saw participation of debate teams from all over the nation at

[2] This refers largely to the highly competitive, largely evidenced-oriented National Debate Tournament style of debate. The time demands on such debaters is such that mass participation is unlikely. This may well push academic debate in the direction of exclusively "off topic" or individual events formats. As indicated above, I would resist this tendency for myself, and wish good luck to those who are more inclined in that direction. My position obviously is that the high level of intensity associated with NDT debate will decrease the number of participants, but that the value to each individual participant will be great.

a wide variety of tournaments, creating a large number of "national debate tournaments."

For many, the days of national travel on a weekly basis will end. Even where there are the financial resources for a national travel pattern, there will still be reasons to increase the importance of regional debate competition. While any one program may be able to travel to a number of regions in the country, the number of schools that will continue this practice will undoubtedly decrease during the next ten years. As the quality of competition largely dictates the quality of debate, the stronger the regional debate, the stronger a program will be. The National Debate Tournament will undoubtedly return to being one of the few occasions where a large number of nationally prominent teams meet. For those wishing a return to a time "when giants walked the earth," this may be a hope for the 1980's.

There may well be an increase in public debates during the 1980's. On the surface, such will appear to be an austerity move. I believe that such will be a sign of false austerity. That is, there will be some monetary savings at the outset from such programs. In the long run, however, as student demand increases, and interest expands, public debate with other schools will take on costs greater than tournament debate, especially on a per student and per debate basis. But public debates may well be important to debate in the 1980's, if only to prove to critics that the same students who succeed in tournaments by speaking quickly can succeed as well with audiences when they speak less quickly. I believe that this point should be discussed in a little detail. There has been a history of research studies in the area of critical thinking and debate. The results have been less than satisfying for some readers. The reason for this lack of satisfaction is derived from debate's attraction to already critical students. Debate, the study critics argue, does not increase critical thinking. Rather, debate attracts critical thinkers. Thus, the critics argue, there is little evidence aside from testimonial evidence, that there are some unique values to debate. What I believe to be important here is that debate provides a place in a university for such thinkers. While critical thinking ability may not be independently caused by academic debate, the activity provides an encouraging and competitive environment for such students. There are few enough places where students can avoid a challenge to succeed. My position is that the provision of such opportunities to an admittedly small number of students should justify the activity. Hence, the arguments which have loomed over the speed of delivery and other objections to NDT debate may well succeed in times of budget crisis. This will undoubtedly affect, at least temporarily, the debate tournament. From my own perspective, this is unfortunate.

A final area in which the 1980's may bring change for debate will be in the role of the debate coach. This will be the final area of discussion of this essay.

Debate and Debate Coaching

Debate and debate coaching at one point in time were among the primary corridors to the speech profession. Great numbers of the present leadership in the speech profession found their beginnings in debate. There was once a time when an active director of forensics could both work competitively with his/her teams, teach classes, and still have time available for some publication—at least enough to justify continued rewards as a faculty member. Those days seem gone forever as we move

into the 1980's. This is true for several reasons. First, the speech communication profession has become more specialized. Those who would maintain a competitive publication record must achieve one in the same fashion that it is obtained in other fields—with graduate assistance, concentrated research, and a large amount of time available for research and rewrite. At the same time, however, the opportunity for debate coaches to be all things to all people has vanished. And with the end of these days come some serious choices for the debate coach of the 1980's. First we may see the end of the days of the professional director of debate. If universities do not see fit to reward the direction of a debate program in a fashion suited to the time and effort which must be devoted to that activity, then we may cease having our graduates as debate coaches. There has been some of this tendency in the 1970's. This looms as a greater possibility for the 1980's. Second, we may see greater application of debate-related research to the journals or other professional fields. If the debate coach of the 1980's wishes to maintain his/her position as debate director, and at the same time participate in scholarly activities, he/she may well test the acceptability of his or her debate work in other professional journals. It is conceivable, for example, that much of the research done by debaters on a variety of topics, may be, with work, suitable for publication in some non-speech scholarly outlet. If the pressure for publication continues for the director, it will be undoubtedly the case that he/she will employ the research expertise of debaters in a cooperative effort to share their knowledge in some non-competitive forum. Such an avenue may in fact reinforce the value of the research that many of us presently direct as debate coaches.

For example, there was not a way to escape a thorough and detailed knowledge of the evolution of the First Amendment free expression rulings by the Supreme Court in work on the topic of mass media communication. There is no clear evidence that these efforts have been translated into efforts to share that information with legal publications to date. Periodically, the debate community has been called upon to offer its expertise at the end of a debate year to various policy makers who may be concerned with a debate problem area. We may see that effort directed to the editors of scholarly journals, where we may well have an important test of the value of our research.

I believe that, like all other things, debate will either change as its environment changes, or it will die. I have suggested some things which at the present time seem likely futures for the activity. These futures, of course, are largely based on the present that I can now view. It was in 1937 that a high level American research commission projected future weapon development, and in doing so missed a few small innovations of the next decade: jet engines, radar, rocket propelled missiles, and nuclear weapons. As Alvin Toffler writes:

> No serious futurist deals in predictions. These are left for television oracles and newspaper astrologers. No one even faintly familiar with the complexities of forecasting lays claim to absolute knowledge of tomorrow. In those deliciously ironic words purported to a Chinese proverb: 'To prophesy is extremely difficult—especially with respect to the future.[3]

I have devoted a great number of hours to academic debate—both as an advocate and as an educator. I have strong beliefs that what I do has value

[3] Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), p. 5.

for the students with whom I am associated. I hope that as the activity continues to evolve—as it did from the syllogistic disputation—I can accept such evolutional, and evaluate it justly. Debate is by no means the final word in education method. In this regard, I hope that we continue to make improvements in the future. I hope that all of us can adapt to those changes, and avoid attacking an activity which should continue to attract good minds to the speech profession. May I never be among those who turn on an activity which gave me an introduction to the speech profession. I am certain that the future will bring some things to debate which I will view as a beginning of the end of the activity—much in the same way that changes during the 1970's brought such cries from coaches and participants of earlier times. I hope when that time comes, I will remember the intellectual challenge and competition which I believe will always remain the core of the activity—and remain silent when tempted to call once again for the return to debate when it was great.

POLICY FIAT: THEORETICAL BATTLEGROUND OF THE EIGHTIES

THOMAS ISAACSON AND ROBERT BRANHAM

With the growing application of the policy-making paradigm during the 1970's, a number of difficulties and questions arose which remained unresolved by the decade's end. If this view of debate is to continue to prosper it is likely that its proponents will need to address effectively and to resolve these issues, as well as other questions that will inevitably arise. This process of paradigmatic adaptation to emerging problems and issues is likely to provide the major theoretical battleground of the coming decade.

Perhaps the most persuasive of the many issues in the application of policy-making to academic debate is that of the appropriate role and limits of fiat. Because debate resolutions stipulate only that a given program or condition *should* be adopted, focus is given not to whether the affirmative plan is probable but rather to whether it is desirable. This latter determination is based upon the hypothetical adoption of the affirmative plan regardless of the real likelihood of this occurrence. The use of fiat is designed to promote the questioning of plan desirability.

By its nature, the use of fiat violates an assumption of normalcy in that it asks us to evaluate that which will not come to pass given the composition of the present system. Two reasons seem to justify the view that assumptions of normalcy should be ignored only with great caution. One possible benefit of the policy-maker paradigm is an educational one in that its use may provide some experience and knowledge in the kinds of thought processes undertaken by real policy makers. Relevancy may be viewed as an important concern in this enterprise, placing a premium upon the ability of both teams to bring to bear "real world" issues revolving around plan adoption. If a view of fiat allows the affirmative to use a set of attitudes to fuel its inherency position and yet, possibly, to deny the negative the ability to reference these attitudes in support of plan attacks, such a use of fiat might be seen as abusive, unacademic and unfair.

One resolution of the fiat-normalcy tension has been to minimize deviations from normalcy and thereby restrict the use of fiat to only what is required to permit a reasoned debate to occur. Some form of fiat is assumed by the logical requirements of a "should"-predicted proposition. However, a variety of important theoretical disputes are generated by the inevitable tradeoff between additional fiat powers granted to the affirmative and the assumption of normalcy. To assume normalcy is to employ traditional tests of evidence and predictive analysis to decide how policy makers would deal with the questions posed by the affirmative plan. Hence, the true tradeoff is one of choosing between imposing an artificial constraint and depending upon the debaters' skills to evaluate the issues surrounding the process of adopting the affirmative plan.

Problems of Fiat

One controversial example of a problem with the policy-making paradigm concerns the point in the policy process at which the affirmative fiat

---

Thomas Isaacson is a student at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Robert Branham is Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at Bates College.

intervenes. The common view is that fiat assumes the adoption of the plan into law (Congressional passage and Presidential signing) of the affirmative proposal.[1] From this perspective, the affirmative plan is the legislative output of the paradigm.

Numerous alternatives to this view of fiat could be advanced. Most restrictively, the affirmative plan may be seen as the bill placed into the hopper for possible Congressional consideration. Such an approach would render all "inherent" cases undebatable since they would never be passed—creating both feasibility and topicality problems.

Other alternatives would permit the affirmative fiat powers beyond the common view. Judges might permit the affirmative not only to adopt but also to implement its proposal through the provision of adequate funds, personnel and jurisdiction, on both an immediate and continuing basis consistent with the original intent. Given the frequency with which real policy mandates falter after adoption due to unsuccessful implementation,[2] this represents a considerable expansion of fiat. Some resolutions might require that a condition be satisfied ("Resolved: That all Americans should be gainfully employed") whereas others refer only to plan passage ("Resolved: That a program of land use control should be enacted"). Because the affirmative has the ability to fiat the existence of the circumstances specified in the topic, the former type of resolution might permit the fiat of a fully implemented policy because the affirmative would not become topical until that end (gainful employment) is achieved. Resolutions of the latter (and considerably more common) form permit no such inference. Without passing final judgment on such a development, it could be noted easily that neither the simulation of a real world policy maker as an educational objective nor the assumption of normalcy as a practical goal are well served by the expansion of fiat to include implementation. Moreover, given the importance of implementational problems to congressional policy efforts, to fiat this issue away removes both a critical real world solvency barrier and a valuable weapon from the already sagging negative arsenal.

The most extreme expansion of fiat would permit the affirmative to avoid the entire issue of plan repeal. Implicit in the notion that the plan exists for the "foreseeable future" is the assumption that the negative cannot successfully argue that the plan would be repealed soon after adoption. The question of whether plan repeal constitutes a legitimate or important argument is entirely unresolved within the debate community at present, although the conceptualization and study of policy termination have received vigorous attention among political scientists.

As we begin a new decade, a commonly used argument suggests that the affirmative could sidestep this question by adopting a plan which specifies its own non-repealability. However, even the most sacred of legislative acts, the constitutional amendment, does not guarantee plan survival (as the proponents of alcohol prohibition discovered).

It might be proposed that the affirmative has no fiat power over post-adoption or post-implementation congressional actions. How Congress could react to a law which it opposed but somehow passed despite its own objections is probably unknowable. In such a circumstance the negative would be on persuasive argumentative ground in contending that all in-

[1] For simplicity we shall refer only to legislative policy making. The issues surrounding executive and judicial policy making shall be addressed later.

[2] Eugene Bardach, *The Implementation Game* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1977).

herent cases would be quickly repealed. While benefits may be found in temporary plan adoption or the possibility that plan adoption would fuel congressional acceptance, if the affirmative needed to fall back upon one of these positions, the nature of debate would be altered drastically.

Thus, the third theoretical alternative would make plan repeal arguments unacceptable and place not only plan adoption and implementation, but also future plan survival, within the range of fiat authority. This intrusion of fiat upon an assumption of normalcy requires the debaters to evaluate a situation which may be logically impossible: a policy which continues to exist despite congressional disapproval and which cannot be altered no matter how strongly opposed. We are given little theoretical guidance to decide how this condition arose save by the magic of fanciful supposition. Discussing such an implausible combination of attitudes and structures maximizes the deviation from normalcy, serving no practical purpose while placing a premium on imaginative guesswork at the expense of reasoned advocacy. An arbitrary decision that the plan is unrepealable for, say, the first year begs the question. If fiat lasts one year, why not one century or one second? Once post-adoption fiat is allowed, the fall into this chaos is unavoidable. The debate is likely to be as heated as that between the pro- and anti-abortion forces about the precise moment of conception.

One suggested reformulation holds this entire issue to be irrelevant since the focus of debate is upon what *ought* to be done, what is desirable, regardless of congressional attitudes. This view is unsatisying in that it ignores a critical component of policy examination, and also fails to solve the extant dispute. If Congress already favors the plan then the debate need not occur; if it is opposed then the issue of congressional response to plan adoption seems entirely irrelevant. This view may reduce the debate to: "Resolved that Congress should favor Plan X," in which case a very different, and quite uninteresting set of issues would guide the debate.

The Future of Fiat

The options concerning the endpoint of fiat—placement of the bill in the hopper, adoption, implementation or assurance of future survival—all contain numerous pitfalls. Solutions are not easy to come by. This difficulty arises in large measure from the sense that fiat involves an imposition upon an unwilling Congress, creating the attitude-policy discrepancy that haunts heavy-handed fiaters.

This discrepancy seems to stem from a failure to examine the *process* of policy adoption. The process of congressional hearings, opinion solicitation, constituent development and activation, media coverage and expert investigation, are crucial inputs not only to policy but also to the foundation and understanding of congressional attitudes. Historically, this issue developed from a different debate question. The advent of the study, referendum and public participation counterplans created a feeling that there was something undemocratic about widespread fiat use. The affirmative responded often that fiat involved not only the assumption of plan passage but also the assumed conclusion of normal legislative processes preceding plan adoption. The notion of two affirmative debaters forcing Congress to adopt the plan at gunpoint was replaced with this saner view based upon normal pre-adoption actions. Thus, the argument of the "time advantage" from "immediate" fiat fell in favor of the realization that, like the present

system, the affirmative plan would take time to reach its final state. Here ended the 1970's.

It will not take long before the negative protests the apparent inconsistency involved in permitting the affirmative to assume normal channels of plan adoption with democratic inputs and processes while at the same time indicting this process under the rubric of inherency. If the affirmative is still to fiat its proposal, what set of events shall we assume preceded this action? To presume the plan appears magically is unappealing. The processes of the present system would not, apparently, produce the affirmative plan.

Two possible reformulations present themselves. The first would have the affirmative pick whatever pre-adoption processes it desired and fiat them. This seems unfair to the negative, illogical in that the process and outcome are likely to be discordant, and to violate the assumption of normalcy.

The discussion herein of a new approach to this rather awkward problem is at best tentative, but should illustrate the direction that debates about debate could take in the 1980's. It should be noted initially there is no single means of plan adoption in actual legislative experience. Sometimes extensive hearings are held; sometimes lobbies exert great pressure; sometimes bills are compromises reached for other end; sometimes public opinion is sought and followed. At other times the opposite of these events may occur. To argue, therefore, that we assume a bill is passed "normally" gives us little guidance as to which of the many possible inputs, processes, constituencies and time constraints affect, in varying degrees, the adoption of the affirmative plan.

As an outgrowth of the search for normalcy we may hope that the adoption process was a genuine political opinion. The desire for fairness and logical consistency may require that the chosen adoption process be likely to produce the affirmative plan as an outcome. Therefore, the notion of fiat should continue to assume that the plan is adopted in the form the affirmative presents. The decision regarding what adoption process preceded its enactment is based upon a prediction: If this plan were adopted, what is the most likely prior adoption process to have caused this outcome? This determination is based not upon a theoretical imposition but rather upon whatever evidence and arguments can be offered to determine what would lead to this result. Perhaps if Congress spent more for food aid (as an affirmative plan) this would most likely have resulted from stepped-up lobbying pressure from groups devoted to this objective or, perhaps more probably, from a renewed round of famines abroad.

This view of pre-adoption processes minimizes the use of fiat, maximizes the assumption of normalcy, rewards traditionally valued debating skills and places a premium on inherency arguments as the vital instruments through which the process of affirmative plan adoption is evaluated. Finally, the issues of implementation failure and plan repeal would no longer need an artificial resolution. Given the debate over circumstances producing probable plan adoption, a set of attitudes, constituencies and other forces can be developed argumentatively and these in turn may be evaluated as to their probable effects upon post-adoption plan developments.

A few implications present themselves immediately as possible consequences of acceptance of this fiat model. First, under some circumstances the most likely pre-adoption coalition of forces leading to plan adoption would not develop for many years, while less probable means are available presently. The affirmative might reasonably be permitted to specify the

approximate date of adoption from which an adoption process could be developed analytically. This is not consequentially different from the current practice of placing phase-in periods of varying length in the affirmative plan. Second, a wide variety of possible counterplans may become competitive due to their inconsistency with the affirmative adoption process. A negative counterplan requiring extensive public participation before action may be taken could compete with a number of affirmative plans if it could be shown that public participation would not be a likely adoption process for the affirmative plan. Current fiat theories give no guidance as to whether the affirmative may assume public participation in the adoption process and thereby render coherent competitiveness argumentation virtually impossible. Third, the set of circumstances surrounding the affirmative plan are altered considerably by this view of fiat. If an affirmative plan calling for a ban on nuclear power could be shown to have arisen only as a result of a severe nuclear accident or a dramatic rise in expert opposition to nuclear power, then a number of other issues would have to be evaluated in light of these situations. However, the fiat of the affirmative plan does not alter the probability of the nuclear accident in the pre-adoption stage, for these are not plan disadvantages. The accident serves to provide a context in which plan adoption becomes appropriate or logically consistent with policy-maker attitudes. If plan adoption stems only from a prospective power plant accident, then the issue of inherency needs further investigation given the probability that the present system, if faced with a severe accident, might naturally abandon nuclear power.

Other Problems

The 1970's produced a variety of other yet unresolved questions involving fiat and other issues. A different type of fiat question is involved in the dispute over whether either team may fiat actions by an agent other than that specified in the topic. Most commonly, this arises when the negative advocates a state or international counterplan for a topic specifying a federal agent of action. Some have argued that allowing non-federal fiat may lead to an infinite regress whereby a team could attempt to fiat good behavior on the part of criminals. If policy making is understood to refer only to *governmental* policy making, then this argument seems invalid in that the expansion of fiat powers would be limited to governmental agencies, which does not seem an unmanageable development.

Another objection to non-federal fiat is that it is unlike the "real world" where no policy maker operates at more than one governmental level. This raises an issue which requires independent resolution, namely, the possible distinction between a policy maker and the process of policy-making. Since the passage of any law requires action by hundreds of Congressmen as well as the President, it is apparent that debaters never try to simulate the actions of a single policy maker, but rather attempt to engage in a thought process similar to policy-making. It is not clear why the discipline of policy-making would not want to consider the question of the appropriate level at which action shall be taken. Once the paradigm clarifies exactly what it is that the debaters are simulating, this question of fiat should be resolved readily.

Another issue in fiat/topicality concerns the appropriateness of non-Congressional fiat at the federal level. In the 1979–80 season some affirmative teams chose to fiat actions by executive agencies such as the FCC while others attempted to fiat Supreme Court decisions. Considerable dis-

pute arose as to the acceptability of these approaches. Objections based on topicality grounds seem unwarranted since the executive and the judiciary are as much a part of the Federal Government as is the Congress The various components of legislative fiat seem to have obvious counterparts in executive and judicial actions. Additionally, the process of attitude determination by examining the most probable bases for an executive order or a Supreme Court decision is essentially the same as for legislative action. While the application of legislative policy-making rules to nonlegislative action may at times be rather awkward, it would seem unlikely that notions of policy-making would remain so inflexible as to deprive the affirmative of these very important topical alternatives. The use of judicial adoption and implementation is likely to increase in the 1980's.

A final issue in fiat has arisen recently regarding the ability of the negative to fiat a counterplan. Current thinking dictates that a counterplan is competitive if adoption of the affirmative plan would eliminate any net benefits from further adoption of the counterplan as well. In other words, plan adoption renders counterplan adoption undesirable. The counterplan serves to illustrate, theoretically, one alternative policy whose adoption is foregone as a consequence of acceptance of the affirmative plan. This, however, is not distinct from the action of any other disadvantage which claims that the plan will prevent a desirable state of affairs from coming into existence. The essence of the social spending priorities disadvantage is that the affirmative plan will prevent a more desirable use of limited financial resources. Why, then, is a disadvantage whereby the alternative resource use is specified (a counterplan) different from one in which the alternative use is predicted evidentially (a traditional disadvantage)? The relevance of the alternative use of resources seems to be the same whether or not a counterplan is introduced. It may be that a counterplan does not warrant the status of fiated policy, but rather by its presentation serves as a clearer illustration of the policy precluded by the affirmative plan.

Even if the logical reasoning of this argument is accepted, this elimination of negative fiat power may be opposed on fairness grounds. Given the current imbalance of debate in the affirmative's favor and the growing acceptance and use of fairness arguments, one may predict that such theoretical disputes as the status of counterplan as disadvantage will be resolved on the basis of fairness rather than the logical relevance of the theoretical concept.

Two related questions of the policy paradigm concern the ability of either team to advocate, however temporarily, more than one policy (usually conditionally defending each of several alternatives). Similar to this question is that surrounding the acceptability of plan modification; that is, changing the text of the affirmative plan or the counterplan after problems requiring adjustment in the text arise. Three senses of plan modification exist. First, plans may contain internal review clauses and may be flexible enough to permit policy change by hypothetical future policy makers, as opposed to in-round alteration by the debaters. This approach possesses broad acceptance. Second, one may argue that Congress, having adopted the plan, could modify it to improve policy operation. This, of course, is a predictive question in which traditional uses of evidence and analysis to determine probable congressional actions are intertwined entirely with the nature of fiat employed in the round. Lastly, the debaters may decide to advocate their new policy, in the round, after some modifications of the plan as presented originally. This would appear to be largely the same issue as is involved in conditional, or multiple, policy advocacy.

Curiously, conditionality (or the defense of more than one policy by a given team in a single round) has come to be seen as a characteristic of hypothesis-testing and not of policy-making. There is no known reason why the policy-making paradigm precludes examination of more than one policy per team. Congress frequently considers a wide range of amendments and substitute bills. If we seek to mimic real world policy-making then multiple conditional policies should be permissible logically. Objections to conditional policies are usually based upon fairness or upon weakening of the quality of debate by spreading the limited time for analysis too thin over too many policies. This, of course, is entirely separate from the question of which paradigm is to be used.

Finally, the relationship of the plan to the resolution needs to be clarified. If the plan is the equivalent of the resolution, then the recent rise of counterwarrants may have some theoretical justification. This, of course, is quite apart from the practical implications of the counterwarrants theory. If the resolution merely serves as a guide to determine subjects the debaters may consider, then theoretical adjustment of what "voting affirmative" implies would be unnecessary. The debate community has not yet accepted this view, enabling counterwarrant strategists to play upon an apparent gap in the policy-making perspective. Acceptance of the view of debate as a process evaluating *plans* rather than general propositions will doubtless prompt numerous new theoretical tangles. It may, for example, be impossible to reject the counterwarrant view of debate as an argument regarding the general merits of the resolution without permitting the advocacy of topical counterplans or resorting to yet another "fairness" constraint.

Conclusion

The resolution of the above issues depends often upon factors which the decision-making paradigm cannot influence. Questions of fairness, quality and educational benefits of and in the activity are separate from the choice and ramifications of paradigms. When these factors become confused with certain paradigms the development of a coherent theoretical perspective is ill-served. If debates could be entirely fair, or of the highest quality and educational utility, we may discover that no "real world" paradigm is adequate to serve as a model for debate. In such a circumstance there may arise a need to develop an entirely artificial set of rules to govern a debate.

Whether the need exists to impose artificial rules, and, alternatively, whether the implications of the paradigm shall serve as our guide may represent the critical issues of the 1980's. Obviously, a decision should provide guidance on issues such as fiat and presumption. A paradigm would also do well to give relevance to (or abolish) current debate concepts such as the plan or the counterplan. More importantly, perhaps, it would be useful if there were some similarities between the paradigm chosen and the desired features of a debate. If the competitive nature of a debate also appears in the paradigmatic model this would help provide guidance on issues such as fairness. Congressional policy-making is, in part, a competitive activity; scientific hypothesis-testing usually is not. Therefore, the nature of real world policy-making already possesses many characteristics present in an academic debate (such as time constraints). If a paradigmatic model used the same values as debate—rewarding skill and honesty while promoting fairness and quality—then the task of reconciling a paradigm with the objectives of academic debate would be eased considerably.

The future of the policy-making paradigm is likely to depend both upon its ability to specify in greater detail the genuine policy processes it purports to model and, where such processes seem inconsistent with desired qualities of debate, its ability to accept modification and artificial constraints. The various issues of policy fiat are likely to provide the first great test of the paradigm's applicability and adaptation.

FORENSICS IN THE EIGHTIES: YOU CAN NEVER FIND AN ORACLE WHEN YOU NEED HER

ANITA C. JAMES

Attempting to decide what issues will become important to the forensic community in the decade of the eighties is rather like trying to predict auto body styles or the winner of the World Series in 1988—who knows what will happen to change plans? Within the forensic community, there are issues that would appear to be important; issues that should be face faced and resolved. (A friend who teaches assertiveness training says that when you hear the word "should" you ought to stop and wonder why something "should be done.)[1] The issues that could become important have to do with external and internal pressures, some of which are outside the control of the individuals within the discipline. If we can consider the issues in those dichotomous, but not mutually exclusive categories, of external forces and internal pressures, then that structures the following comments.

First, there is the question of why any problems/issues should be examined. The underlying premise for these comments is based on the value that comes to the students, to the director and forensic assistants, to the school, and ultimately to the community, from an ongoing forensic program. The value derived from the support of and participation in a forensic program may be visible immediately: a student who does well, trophies, an administrative budget increase, a community program that is well-received. On the other hand, such rewards may be less tangible: a student who discovers there are more ways to approach problem solving than s/he ever imagined, a director who feels the warmth from a team that succeeds where few thought it possible, a college that receives undergraduates of a better quality as a result of the publicity of the forensics team, a community whose educational and cultural outlets are increased by performances or debates by the team. The premise is that these are valuable outcomes and ought to be continued.

The external problems that will affect forensics are similar to those that have plagued us in the past, but now they are magnified. The list includes energy, inflation, and declining enrollments in the 18–22 student age group. These problems cycled through the environment in the sixties and seventies; the difference today seems to be a limit to the resources for solving the problems.

The energy shortage is not a new problem, especially to those of us who listen to round after round of persuasive and extemporaneous speeches or affirmative cases. There is a shortage of petroleum-based products, and this particular shortage cannot be abated by more drilling because we are dealing with finite resources. As one Chevron commercial illustrates so artistically, there are no more dinosaurs to decompose into the primeval ooze. While our persuasive speakers attempt to develop solutions such as

---

Anita C. James is Director of Forensics and Assistant Professor of Communication at Ohio University.

[1] "Should—obligation or propriety in varying degrees, but milder than ought." Funk & Wagnall's, *Standard Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Funk & Wagnall's Company, 1960), p. 1163.

increased use of solar power or more nuclear research, or, as our debaters suggest, more OTG's, wind power, and geothermal exploration, there is a very real and immediate effect on forensics that is not dealt with in the speeches or IAC.

Forensics, as most of us have constituted our programs, involves traveling to other schools for competition. With gasoline averaging $1.20–1.50/gallon, and trips averaging 300 miles/weekend, and more than one vehicle often used, we have an expensive problem.[2] Most forensic budgets do not have a cost of living clause factored into them so they are not adjusting to an annual inflation rate of 12–18%.

What do we do? Look for alternatives to the current tournament format. There is an AFA *ad hoc* committee attempting to develop some alternatives. Some suggestions are to encourage more tournaments to offer debate and individual events so a school is able to maximize the energy dollars expended; to increase our use of electronic media by taping events, much like the Stetson-Montevallo concept,[3] or to use VTR equipment to record debates; to encourage more community programs that keep energy dollars in the community. Certainly, none of these suggestions is unique; forensic programs have experimented with these ideas for years. The point is that we are running out of time, and we are wasting it by simply talking about alternatives without attempting to implement some of them. Change is a positive part of adapting to the environment; success will not be achieved immediately, but we have a history of supporting change that will serve us well.[4]

Inflation is the second problem. Most of us are only too aware of how it is decimating travel budgets—motels are more expensive and dinner time becomes the site of discussions about balanced meals versus fast food. Those within the forensic community who have munificent funding are the lucky ones. As Sharp points out, there are lots of small budget programs trying to make it on a few thousand a year.[5] Once, when budgets were insufficient, it was possible to ask businesses and industry for assistance. Today, as a recent issue of *Quest/80* indicates, those sources are equally strapped.[6] Perhaps owning stock in multinationals really is the answer. Funds are harder to raise through the university and community as other programs are also tapping these sources.

In short, like the problem of energy, inflation might best be handled by confronting it and developing alternatives. What is wrong with moving to a shorter tournament format in debate and individual events? High schools still use the one-day format for most of their meets and the students do not seem to feel deprived. Instead of three-day debate tournaments, go to a two-day format. It may take some adjusting and adapting since eight

---

[2] Sharp cites 450 miles as the average distance traveled in the Western region of the United States. I have reduced that for the Midwest and Eastern regions. Harry Sharp, Jr., "Forensic Activity in the West: Replication of a Study," *Western Speech*, 38 (Winter 1974), pp. 53–66.

[3] National Cassette Tape Individual Events Tournament, sponsored by Stetson University and the University of Montevallo.

[4] In the *Social Psychology of Organizing*, Karl Weick suggests that the ability to adapt to change is what separates organizations that survive environmental change from those doomed to obsolescence. Think of the changes we have made in the last decade: the NFA, AFA national individual events tournament, CEDA debate, CX at the NDT, etc.

[5] Sharp, "Forensic Activity."

[6] Joseph Speiler, "After the Recession," *Quest/80*, 4 (September 1980), pp 26–33.

prelim and three or four elim rounds do not fit into two days, but that format is not inviolate. The educational values of competing will probably not be impaired by shorter tournaments. We need to rethink the approach that was developed in the days of $.25/gallon gasoline, $.30 hamburgers, and $5.00/night motel rooms.

The passing of the baby boom, the end of the draft (perhaps), and the ZPG movement are all contributing factors in the declining enrollment projections for the eighties. With universities expecting declines of 30–40% over the next ten years, the nature of the "average" college student will change.[7] This particular problem, of fewer students in the 18–22 age group, and more returning, older students, may have a profound effect on the way we organize our activity. This is an externally created problem we cannot change—ZPG seems to be firmly established, and the draft, well . . . neither seems likely to change sufficiently to suddenly increase enrollment.

From an internal perspective, however, there are steps that can be taken to work with what we have. The issues that the forensic community faces in the eighties are linked inextricably with energy, inflation, and declining enrollment. Stemming from these problems is the major topic of accountability for our programs. How many students are we serving for each dollar in the travel budget and/or faculty time? What are our students learning from participation in forensics? Are we doing the best job of meeting the needs of our students with tournaments as they are presently designed? Again, these are old problems, but, this time, combined with the external pressures on universities, they have become more urgent.

The issue of budget allocation per student served is a touchy subject; yet, the athletic programs notwithstanding, we must discuss it. We are not a "gate" attraction, although we were once able to draw audiences. Our justifications for expenditures must be based upon educational concerns. We attract bright, motivated, career-oriented students who are building lifetime skills through forensics. Tackling a quarterback is a skill, but it cannot be easily adapted into many careers. Researching and writing a speech, speaking extemporaneously, arguing in 2AR, all develop skills useful in college classes and careers. Our students often tell us what they receive from participation, but that message seldom reaches beyond our offices and hallways. We should be encouraging our students to speak out about the values of forensics to audiences not already involved in forensics—school newspapers, alumni bulletins, community organizations, administrative personnel. Use our resources effectively!

The next issue is almost as touchy as comparisons with athletic programs—the structure of tournaments, particularly individual events tournaments. Over the last decade there has been a trend toward multiple-entry tournaments in which a student may enter two or more events that are offered during the same conflict pattern (time period). The number of events permitted varies with the number of events offered, the conflict patterns, the length of time per round, and the inclinations of the tournament director. Since I permit double-entry in my own tournaments, this is as much an indictment of my tournaments as of others.

We can assume that allowing a student to multiple-enter developed in response to several things: more competitive students who felt that moving

[7] Declines will vary with the region. My state of Ohio expects a loss of 54,381 high school graduates by 1990 for a decline of 31.53% in the possible college population of 17–21. Ohio University, Board of Regents Publication, January, 1978.

from one event to another increased their versatility and chances for doing well at a tournament; from coaches who wanted to maximize the opportunities for students to compete in lots of events during a single weekend; and, perhaps, from the increased revenue for a tournament. Whatever the origins, some abuses have developed that conflict with principles taught in speech communication courses and applied to forensic activities.

If we assume that specific skills can be taught, and learned, in forensics participation, and if we include among the skills those of critical listening, topic analysis, and good audience behavior, then we have a dilemma. The typical double (or triple or quadruple) entry student goes to a round, speaks as soon as possible, departs, enters another room, speaks as soon as possible, departs, and so on. S/he often fails to hear any of the other speeches, certainly is hard pressed to be a good audience member, and is often unable to discuss his/her own placement in a round because there really was not a round, just a speech to a judge. As it is, some of our students are not getting practice in giving speeches to an audience because *there are no audiences!* How can we expect them to learn to adapt to groups if their experience is speaking to an individual? If we want to argue that debate builds skills, but individual events speaking is done for fun, then there is no dilemma. If we want to argue that multiple-entry opportunities increase a student's flexibility and that is most important, then the dilemma does not exist. If, however, we want to argue that some of the skills a student receives are not only centered in his/her own ego but in relating to others, then there is a dilemma!

Solutions are not forthcoming so swiftly. Many of us host tournaments that permit or encourage students to multiple-enter. It seems likely that the first step must come from our associations downward. For instance, as long as the national tournaments accept multiple-entering, then a student is penalized who does not want to do more than one event per pattern.[8] If, however, multiple-entry were not possible at the national tournaments, then there might be less incentive to continue the practice in other tournaments throughout the year. Our young people are often characterized as the "ME" generation, having as a characteristic an inability to move beyond self-gratification to a more open and generous stance. Perhaps we are inadvertantly reinforcing that "me-ness" in some of our own practices.

The final issue is generated by the changing nature of university students. The decline in enrollment is inevitable because of fewer persons in the 18–22 age group, greater expense associated with a college education, and an economy that no longer expands infinitely to absorb the graduates. Tapping the mature, returning student pool is one way universities hope to stabilize their enrollments, but with that change of direction comes something for us to consider.

Participation in forensics is usually geared toward the young student who does not have a spouse, family or full-time job. The format of tournaments, with long drives, frequent classroom absences, and overnight stays, are designed more for participants without many ties than for an older student who may have a spouse, family, job, and a reluctance to be absent from class. Many of our programs are simply not attuned to these differences. Exceptions often come from the two-year schools where the

[8] Multiple-entry is possible as long as the student has qualified in each event in which s/he is entering. Student pentathalon awards are based on multiple-entry as school sweepstakes, while often limited to three or four of a school's top contenders, still reward multiple entry.

typical student is working full-time, studying, and involved with other responsibilities.[9] Accommodations will be necessary in terms of traveling requirements, levels of personal and institutional success, and event preparation. This is not to imply an inferior student or program, quite the contrary. Because the returning student is more often experienced in a career area, s/he can offer a forensic program a different perspective from the recent high school graduate. Additionally, the returning student often has a clearer idea of why s/he is in school and is, therefore, more concerned with developing those skills that are seen as more essential to an overall college/career plan. The question for us is whether we can meet the expectations of those students and continue to serve the younger student as well?

The ways in which we have constituted our activities will have to undergo changes to meet the challenges in the eighties. We need to think very carefully about what we offer a student that develops his/her educational experiential base, his/her ability to compete with others, and his/her social growth. We must consider how we can change to meet the needs of our future students. It is not too early to formulate plans. We are already in the decade of the eighties and many of us are facing one or more of these problems. Our immediate goal should be to plan for the dissemination of information about programs that can meet the changes we are facing, e.g., how have two-year schools adapted; convention programs that deal with alternatives to current tournament formats, funding sources, program adaptation to the returning student, and the educational quality of our programs. There are other issues to be faced as well—our professional associations and their composition, codes of ethics and their enforcement for all members, problems of duplication of services, education of our colleagues and community as to our programs' purposes, etc. It would seem that we will soon face these issues and have to develop our solutions as effectively as possible; but, we are the ones who should do it—after all, you can never find an oracle when you need her.

---

[9] My own experience at a two-year school was that a student was carrying a full academic load, working 30+ hours/week, and often married. This forces the student to be more organized, more specific in what she/he wants to do with the participation in forensics, and less able to travel two or three weekends a month. Occasionally the rewards for directors are greater than with other programs because each student has to overcome more obstacles to his/her participation.

FORENSICS IN THE EIGHTIES

KASSIAN A. KOVALCHECK

In the first volume of P. W. Joyce's *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*, Joyce describes the creation of Brehon Law.[1] At one point in Irish history every *file* was a judge, but it happened that "these two sages had to argue a point in public, while Concobar himself was present listening; and their language was so highly technical that neither the king nor the chiefs could understand them; whereupon the privilege of judicature was taken . . . ."[2] Debate coaches, with their fear that a dean or academic funding officer might actually hear an intercollegiate debate and, in not understanding anything heard, remove funds from forensics programs, should note the problems of the ancient Irish. The prospective for forensics in the 1980's does not appear encouraging.

For decades the doomsayers of debate have been predicting its demise. The predictions have usually been accompanied by a scathing criticism of current debate practices and/or an explanation of how an alternative form of discourse would save and revitalize debate. Since these attacks have often been delivered by those who do not understand the practices they are criticizing, or by people who hate the competitive aspects of debate to begin with, it frequently has been easy for the debate community to ignore their harangues. But, at this point, intercollegiate debate may face some problems that will not be dismissed so easily.

The evidence explosion of the past decade is the first of those problems. Not only has the increase in evidence added to the length of debate tournaments, it has also increased the workload of the debater. Current evidence requirements have taken a toll on debaters' personal lives. With the nationally competitive debater spending about 25 percent of the academic year attending debate tournaments and a significant part of the remaining time on work related to debate, the burden on time can become unbearable. This is compounded by debate having the longest season of any competitive activity, running from the announcement of the topic in July until the National Debate Tournament in April. The natural result of all this effort may be that we will soon have a national tournament, and no one will come. The intelligent prospective debater may decide the rewards are not worth the effort.

Three different examples illustrate this problem. On my desk is a letter from an entering freshman, a previously successful high school debater, declining to join our debate program because he wants to go to medical school, and both he and his parents believe that competitive debate would detract from that goal. Another example comes from a successful high school debater's father, a college professor, who maintains that he would break his son's leg rather than have him debate in college. This professor is a friend of debate, a person who believes that debate provides useful skills, but also a person who believes an entire college education should not be built around this activity. The final example is the case of the father

---

Kassian A. Kovalcheck is Director of Forensics at Vanderbilt University.

[1] P. W. Joyce, *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*, Vol. I (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 171.

of a successful college debater who, after watching his son spend his Christmas vacation filing evidence and typing briefs in preparation for a swing tournament that would occupy the rest of the vacation, wanted to tell his son to stop debating. This man, too, was in favor of debate and pleased that his son participated in debate, but he could not believe that debate should occupy so much of the college year.

An additional problem of evidence is that sheer mass has altered, over time, the nature of debate. As the amount of evidence increased, the speed and efficiency of debaters has also increased. As the quantity and quality of evidence improved, the necessity for pre-debate preparation increased. The results have been that we have ever greater numbers of debaters reading pre-prepared, carefully timed, blocks of evidence in every round of debate. While some of these blocks have led to improved argumentation, many of them have included spurious causal leaps that no one other than a debate judge would take seriously. All of them, however, have made debate an increasingly insulated activity, in which the jargon, signs, and telescoped arguments make sense only to the participants. This would not create a problem except that someday, debaters will have to communicate with people other than debaters. Students who debate because they believe they will learn and polish useful skills may begin to wonder how they can transfer to their future professions the ability to "prove" that increased homosexual employment will melt the polar icecaps in under 90 seconds. Once that wondering takes serious form, we may see a decline in the number of debate participants.

Debate coaches continue to have an ambivalent attitude toward the increasing bulk of evidence. While no debate coach defends mindless arguments, and most make fun of the indiscriminate reading of briefs and the stevedore-like appearance of contemporary debaters, no one wants to tell his or her debaters not to go to the library or to spend less time in preparation. The duty of the debate coach is to help prepare debaters to win debates, to respond to arguments, to increase their efficiency. And, in the past, debate coaches have been able to ignore those who did not want to debate on the grounds that they were lazy, or uncommitted, or did not have the capacity to sustain excellence. But the fear we should have for the 1980's is that we may be driving away the best rather than the worst. We may be losing those who can most profit from debate and have left only those dullards who find satisfaction in reading briefs someone else has prepared for them. The entries at tournaments around the country should add to that fear. Almost all tournaments have fewer participants, with regional tournaments suffering most. Part of the declining participation is, no doubt, a reflection of the financial problems engendered by inflation and the pressure on university budgets, but another part of the problem is that debate squads may not have those fourth and fifth and sixth teams to attend the regional tournaments.

Some alternatives have appeared which could reduce declining participation. For the past few years individual events programs have been skyrocketing. Individual events are popular, of course, for several reasons. Schools and programs have been willing to spend more money on individual events. Individual events coaches, specifically devoted to those activities, have been increasing in number and improving in quality. Individual events, particularly those interpretive in nature, allow for participation by those who might not be interested in forensics in its Aristotelian sense. But part of the increase in individual events participation must also come from the fact that such participation simply requires less time than

intercollegiate debate. At the moment, it is possible for a college student to participate in individual events—with great success—and still live a life similar to "normal" college students. While this will probably change during the 1980's, as coaches and students become even more aggressive and individual events become even more stylized and insulated, forensic programs for the present can increase student involvement simply by adding individual events participation.

The second alternative is CEDA debate. Theoretically, this form of debate should offer the most hopeful outlet for debate in the 1980's. Using propositions more attuned to questions of value, and being predisposed to clarity and persuasion rather than speed and massive amounts of evidence, CEDA could provide an outlet for those bright undergraduates who desire competition without the all pervasive burdens of standard debate. CEDA debate, however, is currently plagued by confusion and indirection. Some of the judges and participants believe it to be no different from standard debate, that the topic only indicates an area for research and that the "spread" remains the most valuable technique. Others have the concept that spending time in the library is vaguely immoral and that disputation should only take place based on "pure logic," whatever that is. Until CEDA resolves this conflict, it will remain in debate limbo with quality debate and debaters uncertain. Since those with evidence usually prevail over those without evidence, CEDA debate will probably follow the pattern of the NDT, but, given enough emphasis, we could have a few years in which CEDA will provide quality debate and undistorted undergraduate lives.

At one time debate coaches argued that the leaders of tomorrow were to be found in the debaters of today. We have enough past examples to make the argument realistic. But for the 1980's we should be concerned that the argument will no longer be true. Those leaders of the past and present did not spend all their time in the library trying to find a disadvantage to III-A-1. We have to worry not only about the students we are attracting to debate, but also about the student we may be causing to reject debate. If we don't worry about this problem, university officers may end our worries for us.

DEBATE IN THE EIGHTIES: CHARTING A COURSE

ALLAN D. LOUDEN

In the last issue of *Speaker and Gavel* I evaluated the impact of the seventies on debate. The shift in emphasis from more fully integrated programs in the early seventies to increasingly exclusive programs of individual events and off-topic debate, points up problems for traditional debate in this decade. The nature of programs is evolving, in part, as a response to the exclusive nature of the debate community. The changes have resulted in increased alienation and division within the forensics community. Individual students as a consequence are being exposed to fewer opportunities. It also threatens to undermine the health of high school debate because the institutions which train the coaches are less active in traditional debate.

In this essay I will discuss, in broad terms, some potential solutions. I recognize at the onset that the suggestions are simplified and ignore the complexities inherent within any institution. However, I believe the general thesis merits our attention.

Sometimes it is as if the debate community were fighting a rear-guard action against the inevitability of the "times." The picture of the future is often painted in hues of pessimism. Spokespersons for this point of view claim that the shift away from traditional debate is a natural result of the times and circumstances. They argue that factors like "budget constraints, departmental hostilities and lazy students" explain the change in emphasis. I am sure all the above have contributed in certain circumstances, but more often they are only an excuse. Consider for a moment the nature of these excuses.

Many a coaches' party is sustained on conversations of how tough the budget problem is. Yet, on balance, those programs which can articulate their purpose and serve the students, contrary to popular myth, have growing budgets. It seems more dependent on who is promoting the budget than a function of the "times."

In departments which are hostile, debate is usually criticized as teaching a "non-relevant communication style." If a program is broad-based enough to provide the opportunities to learn many "communication styles," then the uniquely important skills of debate can also be defended. When we become too narrow, in whatever direction, we invite justified criticism. Those of us who appreciate the value of debate *per se* can also realize that the activity is only "perceptually non-relevant." Perhaps we need to remind our departmental peers the part debate plays in developing argumentation theory, that it remains an entry point for some of the best minds in the profession, and yes, that critical thinking is still a valuable skill. It is a matter of changing perceptions.

The lazy student excuse (often phrased as, "the rigors of debate are inappropriate to those raised in the 'me' generation") is more often a statement about the coach's commitment. I can think of no instance where debate did not thrive when the leadership was provided.

These "reasons" are more inherent to the person directing a program than the times. As argued in the last issue, high entry barriers and unequal

---

Allan D. Louden is Director of Forensics at Wake Forest University.

status rewards better account for the shift away from traditional debate. The following are suggestions for addressing the problem.

Maintaining Participation

It is fundamental to the growth of debate that we have an accessible activity. It is also necessary for debate to take place at all levels if we are to provide high school debate coaches and offer this educational experience to more individuals. I believe that an important key to involving and retaining both programs and individuals in debate is the status and esteem provided. The severity of the entry barriers is to some extent a function of the rewards gained.

It is undoubtedly impossible and undesirable to remove the prestige we now associate with success on the "national circuit." This does not imply, however, that students who achieve on other levels of debate should be regarded as second class citizens. Importantly, meeting esteem needs can make the group attractive enough to encourage greater involvement. Only when programs broaden their scope and recognize through their actual behavior that the beginner as well as the national winner contribute, can this be achieved. I believe this implies we recognize a wider range of what is considered "success."

Currently, numerous means exist for recognition within the forensics community. Nearly all of them, however, are contingent upon tournament success. This standard is useful and appropriate but there are other standards for assessing achievement. Individual programs must recognize this among their students. More to the point, however, the use of other standards for assessing and rewarding entire programs seems particularly appropriate.

I am sure we all know programs which make substantive contributions but do not win every competition they enter. Those institutions which train the teachers, which give opportunities to the untrained and which provide a breadth of opportunities, deserve the general community's recognition. Their continuance in debate may be related. Efforts such as Jack Howe's national sweepstakes have made progress in this direction, but it, too, uses tournament successes as the primary determinant. His work is laudable because it has provided the justification for many programs' expansion but more needs to be done employing broader definitions of success.

Establishing criteria and means of recognition might be profitably addressed by the AFA, for example. Such a task, albeit difficult, is not impossible. We already have some consensus as to what it means to promote "forensics communication training with a humanistic foundation." The Sedalia conference report could serve as a guideline for establishing criteria. Perhaps one of the reasons many of the recommendations have failed to be implemented generally is that they reflect more closely our "educational goals: 'what it takes to win.'" Along with winning, these other goals should be encouraged. Such reinforcement may give reason to the programs which, unfortunately, have given up traditional debate.

Overcoming Ethnocentrism

The ethnocentrism which characterized the late seventies can best be addressed by the broad recommendation of this essay—notably broad-based programs. When students have several levels of entry into a program, they are exposed to several "communication styles" and have the oppor-

tunity to acquire increasingly sophisticated skills. I am sure the style of NDT debaters could be aided by the perspective CEDA provides, just as CEDA could enhance argumentation by interacting with NDT debate. It is also true that a debater interprets and persuades, just as individual event participants engage in argumentive discourse.

In addition to the internal structure of a specific program, an important solution to this separatism would be to offer more integrated tournaments. This has long been true in the West and I believe students are exposed to more of what the activity has to offer. The South and East, in particular, have institutionalized the ethnocentrism through separate tournaments. Students and coaches can become pretty intolerant of each other when they never interact. Even within broad programs the various "squads" have attitudes of "us *vs* them." The mode of behavior for members of the same team becomes noncooperative *because* the external world (tournaments) legitimizes this viewpoint.

The above discussion is not to suggest that all tournaments have all events. The current practice of having a student enter ten events in an individual events tournament is its own absurdity. On the other hand, I do not know why we should fly across the country three times for national finals in NDT, NIET, and CEDA. The truth of the matter is that we simply cannot, so we narrow rather than broaden the program.

This is also not meant to argue against change and experimentation. The growth of alternative debating, individual events, and changes within traditional debate (e.g., cross-examination and experimentation with such innovations as judge interaction) are healthy. These changes, however, need to evolve with some sense of direction and purpose. To this end the Sedalia conference provided parameters, drawn up with broad professional representation. The conference report is surely not responsible for the trends of the seventies but it did serve an important legitimization function for experimentation. As the implications of these changes become more obvious we need, in the eighties, to again find a "sense of the community." Any activity with its own dynamic needs periodic reassessment. Such a conference report, unlike scattered articles, gives us a yardstick to measure changes and legitimizes changes based on a reasoned consensus.

Conclusion

Hopefully, I have avoided the pitfalls of projecting what the eighties will bring. I simply have no idea. I am, however, optimistic that debate will continue as an important educational experience during the decade. The danger lies in our subscribing to the myth that "all will be well." Debate will also require a little help from its friends.

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE: PROPOSALS FOR A STRUGGLING ACTIVITY

JOHN T. MORELLO

In an earlier essay, I argued that the lack of concern for delivery had turned intercollegiate debate into a boring and isolated endeavor. Having launched those criticisms, it is only appropriate that a cure be advanced.

At the outset, we should observe that the task of forcing debaters to improve habits of oral communication will not be accomplished easily. Numerous influences exist which perpetuate the delivery problems characteristic of modern debate. The abusive style of debate speaking is, sadly, ingrained in the activity. Debaters have refined the art of hyperventilated haranguing through years of practice. Ludicrous speech mannerisms have been nurtured by judges, who either fail to comment about silly speaking behaviors or who dismiss delivery as a peripheral or irrelevant characteristic of effective debating. So the ingrained practices remain, and debaters do not change because no one gives them any reason to want to change.

Worse yet is the apparent fact that tournament practice serves to perpetuate bizarre modes of communication. The students who speak incomprehensively win debates and speaker awards. The rare debater who elects to slow down and develop arguments fully often loses because "too many issues were dropped in rebuttal." Judges who "vote on delivery" are branded as fools and nitwits by those whom they criticize for unintelligible argument.

A final impediment to the improvement of the debater's interest in delivery is the virtual anonymity which shrouds the college debate tournament. This means that the plesasure of enduring oral absurdity falls on but a few. Those who cease to have the stomach for it merely leave the activity. A few hang on in the hopes that changes are coming, and they are usually frustrated when nothing happens. In the process, the popularity of college debate wanes. Programs vanish, students leave the activity for other pursuits, and coaches abandon the circuit for less troublesome occupations.

If the decade of the seventies shows anything it is that traditional-style college debate is highly resistant to change. Alternative styles of debate such as the off-topic tournament and the Cross Examination Debate Association, which provide useful alternatives to traditional debate, have their weaknesses. The key problem is that they are alternatives which co-exist with traditional debate. They do not exert any influence on the forensic community to recognize that traditional debate is in trouble. What we need, therefore, is some way to force a change in the conduct of traditional, national topic debating. Unless we end our complacent disregard for the central fact that college debaters communicate incoherently, the 1980's may well mark the final collapse of competitive debate in this nation.

For the remainder of this essay, let me propose some fairly sweeping changes in the structure of national topic debating. Let me ask readers to keep two things in mind as I make these suggestions. First, set aside the issue of practicality since I fully realize that some of my ideas (maybe all of them) have some pragmatic problems which require fine-tuning before

John T. Morello is Assistant Professor of Communication Arts and Director of Forensics at James Madison University.

implementation. My purpose here is to propose approaches which can be refined and improved through analysis and discussion by others. We must start somewhere. Second, set aside the issue of enforcement of these guidelines. Just assume that these recommendations are to be implemented and enforced through "author fiat." The challenge for forensics in the eighties is the revitalization of delivery, with the end result that debaters will become more than just speed readers. Some of these actions may help improve the quality of communication found in the normal debate tournament.

Change Topic Selection

In part, debaters speak like blithering idiots because the topics we debate encourage it. The debate topics of the past few years have been too broad. The result is that almost anything can be defended as legitimate interpretation of the topic, meaning that the topic does no more than begin the season. It certainly does not limit what we argue about in any given year. Last season, for instance, a team could provide a "reasonable" definition of the topic by merely requiring that television stations air a certain number of public service announcements on anything from diabetes to the heartbreak of psoriasis. And that topic was not nearly as bad as some we suffered through in the seventies (remember the gathering and utilization of information fiasco?).

We need, therefore, more narrowly construed debate topics. The easiest way to accomplish this is for the American Forensic Association to require that the national debate proposition be plan-specific. The topics we debate ought to clearly identify the program which the affirmative must defend. Today's topics merely isolate an area for policy discussion, and the affirmative freely proposes any program of action which fits into that area. We know the results of debating these kinds of topics—slimy cases countered by counterplans, counter warrants and an entertaining menu of prepared sheets explaining how everyone's statistical studies are bogus.

Why not formulate simple and direct topics like "Resolved: that the draft should be reinstated?" Affirmatives could still be creative in formulating a specific version of the draft. Negatives would enter each round knowing what the topic was. Research burdens on everyone who participated would become more reasonable. Who knows? Limiting the topic might even make debating fun again.

Would narrower topics help revitalize the role of delivery? Certainly. If topics were narrower in concept, affirmative cases would be correspondingly simplified because the affirmative would have less material to cover. Research sources would be more limited than with broader topics, meaning that debaters might have to do a little reasoning rather than relying on blurb quotations all the time. Counter warrants would vanish as a strategy for sure, and with a more limited field for argument, negatives might even foresake the studies counterplan for some argument on the substance of the proposition. Debaters would learn again that evidence alone would not win debates. With both sides *sure* of what would be debated, there would be a smaller information disparity between the affirmative and the negative. With the *amount* of evidence as a virtual draw, teams would learn that victory depended on persuading the judge that one side's arguments and evidence were better than the other's. These kinds of arguments would naturally have to take place at a slower speed, since they would always be extemporaneous in nature and artistic in design as opposed to

being blocked out ahead of time with a reliance on the reading of the words of others.

Change the Debate Season

Another problem which contributes to the bizarre nature of debating is the length of the debate season. Aside from professional hockey and basketball, few activities have such a long competitive run as does college debate. The topic is revealed in July, and tournaments begin in September and run until late April. The length of the season is absurd. The longer we keep debaters grappling with the same topic area, the more chance for twisted cases to arise and the weaker our will becomes to resist them.

So let's shorten the debate season. I propose that the debate topic be announced on August 15. As a sidelight here, let me note an ancillary advantage to this idea—it would give our topic selection committee more time to formulate effective policy propositions for debate. Tournaments would probably begin in late September, as they do now. However, I propose that we designate the period from September to the end of January as the varsity season. *Only* varsity tournaments would occur at that time. We would then designate the first two weeks in January as the time for the district tournaments, leading up to the National Debate Tournament on the last weekend in January. The varsity season would end at the end of January, and no varsity level tournaments would be permitted after February 1.

I further propose that we designate February through April as the novice season, with a novice defined as a person in his/her first two years of college debate. The novice season would end in late April with a national tournament. Teams would qualify to nationals by reaching the elimination rounds at invitational tournaments that met certain minimum standards for format and size of field.

Would this reconstructed season help return delivery skills to debate? Possibly. At the very least, we could use the new set-up to isolate our novices from the abuses of motor-mouthed veterans. If the quarantine were relatively complete, in a few years we could stamp out the tradition of fast talking by simply starting to train our novices not to do it, and by keeping them away from the lost causes of the varsity circuit.

I also think that shortening the varsity circuit would help limit senseless delivery. The hysteria which is college debate is always at its lowest early in the year. If we announced the topic later, and ended the season earlier, most debaters simply would not have the time to get revved up and into overdrive. When we add the effect of a narrower topic, the end result might be a tendency toward a slower pace of debate. This may not be enough to totally eradicate bad delivery from debate, but it would be a helpful step.

Change Tournament Formats

Debaters speak like maniacs because they rarely encounter judges who will penalize them for it. The judges are out there—they just never get the chance to judge the "big teams" in crucial situations. The answer to this is to let them judge, and so the AFA needs once and for all to enforce a rule which ends the power-matching of debate judges. Along with this, the AFA should end the practice of blackballs and strike sheets which are used at so many tournaments. As long as the teams who speak like raving lunatics are judged by their friends, the practices of silly delivery will remain. When *all* teams can be judged by persons of varying philosophies,

debaters will learn to adapt. When judges who speak out about the importance of delivery realize that their views will no longer condemn them to the rankest available debates, they will no longer be afraid to vote against teams they cannot understand.

We have passed motions in favor of random judge assignment, only to see those recommendations blatantly violated at most major tournaments. To enforce its rules, the AFA should consider developing a sponsorship system for debate tournaments. To be eligible for the National Debate Tournament, teams would have to have debated three-fourths of their rounds in AFA sponsored tournaments. The AFA would sponsor only those tournaments which used random judge assignment. The AFA would certify tournaments as worthy of sponsorship only when it was convinced that judges had in no way been power-matched. The burden of proof would be on the tournament host to convince the AFA that his/her tournament deserved sponsorship. Once the AFA granted sponsorship, it should feel free to observe the tournament's judge assignment procedures during the actual contest to see that the principle of randomness was followed.

Change the National Debate Tournament

One way to improve the role of delivery in debate is to break the stranglehold which the so-called big schools in debate have on the NDT. These are the schools who control the at-large selection processes, and thereby always wind up at the NDT whether or not they really deserve to be there. If you look at the NDT for the past few years, you see the same teams present with most of those same teams always qualifying for the elims. Some would say these are simply "the best teams." I counter that these are merely the teams which set, control, and implement the rules for getting to the NDT. Success at NDT, thus, is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

We need to open up the NDT—to make it representative of the nation of debate programs. We also need to draw back into the NDT those schools who cannot afford to spend the money to get there by an at-large bid. The easiest way to open up the NDT is to eliminate *all* at-large bids. As it stands now, a fast-talking team can win its way to the NDT by doing well at a few tournaments where most of the teams and judges involved view debating as a non-communication activity. These teams rarely have to test their skills against a team of a different argumentative philosophy in front of a randomly determined judge.

Some argue that the at-large system helps ensure quality at the NDT. Baloney. If the teams which earn at-larges were made up of high quality debaters, why do we need to excuse them from the district qualification? If we are afraid that they won't get past districts, maybe these teams aren't so hot in the first place.

By opening up the road to the NDT, schools believing that debate was a communication activity would have a greater chance to participate in this most prestigious event—since there would be more slots for qualification through district contests. Also, schools which previously avoided debating "in district" like the plague would be forced to compete again against those teams which they have avoided in the past. And the teams which avoided certain judges and judging philosophies by going to tournaments were their critics were "hand-picked" would now be forced to debate before all sorts of viewpoints. The result would be, in my mind, a distinct moderation of the delivery abuses we have seen in the past.

Conclusion

How do we put delivery skills back into debate? We do it by simplifying the topics we argue about and by shortening the time that we let students argue those topics. We do it by requiring and enforcing a rule for the random assignment of judges, thereby forcing debaters to confront a variety of judges and judging philosophies. We do it by an open NDT, which takes that tournament away from the hand-picked few who dominate it today. Once we change the style of debate it takes to get to the NDT, we will see a broad movement to new styles of debate in every sector of the nation. As schools see that fast-talking is no longer the only way to get to the NDT, and be successful there, the need to imitate the senseless style of the seventies will pass.

I freely admit that my own debaters are guilty of many of the delivery abuses which characterize intercollegiate debate today, although I steadfastly maintain that they are nowhere near as obnoxious to listen to as some of the titans of the circuit I have heard recently. It is hard for a coach who believes that debaters ought to be understood easily when they argue to force that viewpoint on students when everything else in the activity suggests that effective delivery is something the debater need not bother to develop. When I began writing these essays for *Speaker and Gavel*, I was so frustrated about the state of debate that I wanted to give up the activity. After venting my spleen for a bit, I now wish that I could help start a movement to introduce a little oral sanity into the practice of college debate. The idea of having college students debate serious and important questions of the day is a great educational device. If our topics for debate made sense on the surface, to the average citizen, the public might be intrigued enough to start watching debates for intellectual stimulation and enjoyment. If our students were taught to debate while still observing some basic guidelines of effective and pleasing oral communication, we might *proudly* invite the local community and university administrators to observe the tournaments we host. Perhaps the decade of the eighties will permit us to work toward these goals if we first come to realize that it is time to stop all the silly shouting and to reacquaint our debaters with the importance of developing some basic delivery skills.

THE 1980'S: A WATERSHED DECADE

MICHAEL PFAU

Predicting the future requires more than "speculation" and "an Olympian view," the ingredients that Bill Balthrop called for in his request for this essay. It additionally requires much audacity, for the future has a way of continually eluding its predictors. I will strive to ground my prognostications in existing trends in the hopes of precluding the pitfalls of errant prediction.

I believe that the 1980's may prove to be a watershed decade for competitive debate. Three trends, unleashed during the decade of the 1970's, will reach their fruition in the 1980's with notable resound. These trends, involving the continued proliferation of information, the financial squeeze imposed by the escalating costs of tournament travel coupled with the tightening of college and university budgets in the face of declining enrollment and taxpayer pressure, and the problem of maintaining instructional expertise despite a sharp reduction in anticipated teaching slots in speech communication, pose a real challenge to competitive debate during the coming decade. The activity will survive intact, but in doing so, it will undergo change.

An acceleration in the proliferation of information is almost a certainty in the 1980's. All scholars of prognostication concur. I delineated the special problems posed by this information explosion in my last essay. I think that these will continue to generate a healthy controversy among professionals. The computer, however, may hold the solution to one part of these problems—that concerning the personal burdens and the institutional inequities of debate research, which are aggravated by the information explosion. The research requirements for team and individual success in contemporary debate are simply staggering. They have produced two consequences. First, many students (some of proven ability) are dropping out of debate prematurely because of the enormous personal price extracted for competitive excellence. Second, notable institutional inequities stem in large part from disparities in access to information. The smaller school, which is geographically isolated and with modest library holdings, will find it increasingly difficult to compete.[1] Enter the computer; this technological innovation will find its way into competitive debate in the coming decade. Computers can collect, store, process and retrieve the vast quantities of information which are essential to today's debater. Some debaters have begun to utilize computers in information searches—establishing exhaustive bibliographies in specific issue areas. Thus, the computer has already made its initial debut in contemporary debate. The next step will come during the 1980's with the application of computer technology to day-to-day information retrieval. Instead of going directly to books, journals, government documents, and the like, debaters will turn

---

Michael Pfau is Director of Forensics at Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

[1] The critical need for access to an ever-growing pool of resources is the principal reason for the popularity of debate handbooks and the increasing popularity of high school debate institutes/workshops even in the face of rising student charges and a deflated national economy. Institutes/workshops and handbooks are handmaidens to the high school debate program!

to the computer to retrieve specific information. This development will allow for much more efficient and productive utilization of research time for the individual participant. Also, as computer costs fall, it will equalize the access to information between the small and the large school. Yet, while the computer should mitigate one facet of the consequences wrought by proliferation of information, it cannot redress those which remain. These stem from the increased breadth and depth of issues which underpin the topics debated. These pressures will increase during the coming decade.

The financial squeeze imposed by escalating costs of tournament travel coupled with tightening college and university budgets in the face of declining enrollments and taxpayer pressures will pose the most serious challenge to competitive debate in the 1980's. In a real sense, the college invitational tournament scenario is the product of a different era—an era of cheap gasoline, cut-rate airfares, and an abundance of college and university resources. This era is gone forever—in spite of the reluctance on the part of some of us to admit it. The coming decade will apply the *coup de grace*. The 1980's will bring gasoline prices of $2 to $3 per gallon, and airfares at approximately double their mid-1970's level. The debate budget of almost all colleges and universities will fall far short of these escalating costs. In addition, America's colleges and universities are on the brink of a new era—one that demands a different set of operational questions. The time of plenty is over; the time of scarcity is here! This doesn't involve speculation. One simply needs to read the handwriting on the wall. The number of 18-year-old Americans will fall by 19 percent over the next 10 years.[1] Yet, the gap between costs and the revenues derived from tuition, gifts, and taxation will continue to grow. In the face of such pressures, forensic budgets in the 1980's are unlikely to remain abreast of inflation; in fact they may become an easy target for cost conscious administrations.

One probable outcome is the return to regional tournament circuits—the kind of compact tournament schedules which characterized collegiate debate during the 1950's and early 1960's and which typify high school debate today. The active and reasonably funded program may still attend one or two national invitational tournaments, but most of its resources would be channeled into quality regional competition. The National Debate Tournament is unlikely to be affected by this change. The revival of the regional tournament circuits is not necessarily bad. Most college debaters can profit (maximize personal growth opportunities) from such an experience. In fact, it is safe to say that substantial resources are currently wasted on select national tournament opportunities which are unwarranted based on the individual participant's research commitment, skills development, and intellectual maturation. In addition, revival of regional tournament circuits carries at least one positive, residual impact: broader participation in competitive debate. One of the unfortunate consequences of the drift to a national invitational circuit has been the emasculation of regional debate. Colleges and universities which could not—or would not—make the shift from a regional to a national level found themselves relegated to the "backwater" of intercollegiate debate. Some withdrew their resources and their support from competitive debate. The revival of the regional debate circuit might bring some of them back. In any case,

[1] Gary A. Greinke, Prospects for Lutheran Higher Education at the Dawn of a New Era," *The Cresset* (November, 1979), p. 12.

the financial squeeze is here and the national invitational circuit is sure to feel its impact. This trend has already set in. The 1979–1980 debate season was characterized by declining participation at virtually every national invitational tournament. This is sure to accelerate during the 1980's.

Maintaining instructional expertise will prove especially difficult during the next decade. All forecasts agree: due to declining enrollment, fewer teaching positions in higher education will open during the 1980's. In addition, movement between institutions, once the tool for the revitalization of faculties, will virtually cease in the face of a tightening job market and the slow but sure elimination of tenure (for newly hired staff) in higher education. These prospects are especially onerous for collegiate debate as a result of the short life span and high "burnout" rate of coaches. The question is: how will colleges and universities provide for replacement of those who choose to terminate their debate coaching functions but remain in their teaching jobs? In all likelihood they can't replace such persons. Thus, we will see an increase in the proportion of temporary coaches (law and/or graduate school students who are temporarily hired to coach) and the discontinuance of some programs altogether. The debate community must respond to this development. Through its national organizations it must work closely with colleges and universities to apprise them of available debate coaches; and it must provide training and regenerative seminars and programs for the growing number of part-time coaches and faculty supervisors.

The 1980's will pose significant problems for competitive debate. Three trends, involving the continued proliferation of information; the financial squeeze imposed by the escalating costs of tournament travel, coupled with a tightening of college and university budgets in the face of declining enrollment and taxpayer pressure; and the problem of maintaining instructional expertise despite a sharp reduction in anticipated teaching slots in speech communication, represent substantial challenges to competitive debate during the coming decade. But, we must be resilient, willing and able to adapt to these new contingencies. If we do, and I believe that we will, competitive debate will continue to play an instrumental role in higher education.

FORENSICS IN THE EIGHTIES

JAMES W. PRATT AND LARRY G. SCHNOOR

What are the problems and issues which forensics must face in the '80's? That is a good question and a complex question. An examination of forensic activity in the 1970's suggests several trends already evident. They are as follows:

1. Participation in debate is decreasing, as measured both by number of schools and number of students.
2. Participation in individual events is increasing, as measured both by number of schools and number of students.
3. Tightening energy supplies are influencing travel patterns and amount of travel as well as use and availability of college facilities.
4. Inflation is reducing the buying power of forensic budgets.
5. Projected enrollment declines and the changing nature of the student constituency are occurring.
6. The academic area of speech communication, in which most forensic programs find their homes, is changing.
7. We're all getting older, and the new folks who are moving into forensics aren't quite the same as we were.

In attempting to support and analyze each of these trends, we have relied upon random thoughts, causes, speculations and directions suggested by each of them.

Participation in debate is decreasing, as measured both by number of schools and number of students. Why is this happening? The activity is changing. Topics are becoming broader, not by their wording or structure, but because of what coaches/judges are willing to encourage and reward. Consequently, debaters must be prepared to encounter a very broad range of cases, and they must be prepared with evidence. The commitment of time and energy required of students who wish to be even marginally successful in debate has increased substantially, and that is a discouraging factor. Few opportunities in debate exist for students unwilling or unable to commit themselves very extensively to the activity. CEDA, supposedly directed toward this situation, is not very different. So programs have decreased in size, and once-large debate tournaments have disappeared or shrunk to sizes which, in some instances, are only marginally viable. Economic factors are becoming increasingly influential: small programs are cost-ineffective, tournaments become financial drains on host institutions, NDT subscription fees contribute less to that organization. Structural changes have little impact: while coaches/judges continue to endorse these behaviors, debaters will continue to behave in that way. Financial constraints may be most likely to produce change.

Participation in individual events is increasing, as measured both by number of schools and number of students. This is directly related in part to the decline in debate. Individual events participation has attracted some of those who are discouraged by the demands of debate. In addition, IE has a broader appeal than does debate because of the variety of events

---

James W. Pratt is Director of Forensics at the University of Wisconsin–River Falls. Larry G. Schnoor is Director of Forensics at Mankato State University.

offered. And it is possible to do well in IE without the amount of involvement now required in debate. IE is simpler administratively, because entries are typically individuals rather than teams, and because tournaments don't require even numbers. It is also more cost-efficient than is debate, which often makes securing funding easier and mitigates some of the effects of budget cuts and inflation. The advent of national tournaments, the increase in the number of events available, and the standardization of event rules (largely because of the national tournaments) all contribute to increased size. The trend of growth seems to be well established.

Tightening energy supplies are influencing travel patterns and amount of travel as well as use and availability of college facilities. Many schools must operate forensic programs under official (or unofficial) travel restrictions. Location of tournament, as well as size and scope of tournament—always considerations in tournament selection—become more and more important. The generally greater availability of college vans has helped somewhat. The decline of rail travel and the increasing costs of air travel keep public transportation a relatively unattractive option. There is no reason to believe that travel restrictions will ease; most likely they will become more severe. The effect on tournaments in isolated locations and on tournaments which seek national participation will be harmful. Use and availability of college facilities for tournaments is partially related to energy and partially to changing use patterns. Increasingly, college facilities are being used for classes for longer periods each day and on evenings and weekends. Fewer new buildings are being constructed because of projected enrollment declines. Administrators are often more reluctant to open and heat buildings during tournaments . . .). So the trend of shorter and/or more concentrated tournaments, the disappearance of tournaments which begin on Thursdays, the increase of tournaments which extend through Sunday will probably continue. The development of one-day tournaments, both for debate and individual events may become a pattern that will develop in those areas of the nation where enough schools exist to make it feasible. It's not all bad, of course. Students won't miss as many classes while they participate. But then, coaches will sacrifice more and more of what resembles a normal life.

Inflation is reducing the buying power of forensic budgets. What needs to be said about inflation. Its effect began to be felt in the late 70's and is bound to continue well into the 80's, regardless of which political party is in office. How will it affect forensic programs? Many forensic budgets will be reduced or held fixed. Those fortunate programs receiving increases will rarely be able to keep pace with inflation. Everybody will become more and more adept at cost-cutting. Some will eliminate certain tournaments; some will restrict participation. Some will turn from the higher cost debate to lower cost individual events. Some will try to cut costs at each tournament by reducing living standards or requiring participants to pay more. Some will begin money raising projects as a team effort while others will simply overspend. Whatever the case, all forensic programs will feel the effects of inflation.

Projected enrollment declines and the changing nature of the student constituency are occurring. Everyone seems terrified of enrollment declines. Cutbacks in programs, staff, funding, facilities in anticipation of a bleaker tomorrow seems to be the rule of the day. Even at growing institutions, the feeling is often that this growth will soon end. So the outlook for increased funding, staffing, facilities, etc., for forensics isn't too good.

Certainly there's a shift in the nature of the student body: more relatively older folks, more working students, more nontraditional students. Whatever the changes, we need to keep alert of whether we're serving our constituency. If it changes, does our program change? It had better.

The academic area of speech communication, in which most forensic programs find their homes, is changing. Time was once when almost everyone in the field of speech communication had a background in debate and forensics. Not any more. It is our perception that lots of folks in the field look down on the activity and consider it unimportant or peripheral. Why waste money sending interpers out to a tournament when that money could be paying for computer time for some empirical research—right? We think it is pretty clear that the field of speech communication has broadened and has moved away from the performance aspects once very central. Whether that is good or bad is another question, but we think it is descriptively accurate. The often unquestioning support for debate and forensics that one might find within a department in the past aren't there any more. There are competing programs and interests for limited resources, and there is no universal acceptance of the value of forensics. So we may need to do a better selling job, or justification job, or whatever.

We are all getting older, and the new folks who are moving into forensics aren't quite the same as we were. Which brings us to the new generation. They're not the same. (Again, whether that's good or bad is another question.) There's a great deal of turnover among program directors (if we put aside the Pratts, Schnoors, Nobles, and Armstrongs for awhile, as we already have the Walshes). People get burned out, or are recognized for their great talents and transformed into deans or presidents. Some seek fame and fortune (usually fortune) in the world of business. Most people don't look upon directing forensics as a choice assignment. We think there is less of the combination of speech academic background and forensics participation background among new directors. Emphasis on forensics in graduate programs in speech is not as great as it was. Too bad. Maybe some of us will keep on lending stability, enjoying it as we do, or maybe we'll all become antique dealers.

There we are: a nice stream-of-consciousness discussion. Everything is, of course, purely speculative and unsupportable . . . but we do feel it provides a graphic view of what directors of forensic programs will have to address in the coming decade.

GOING PUBLIC: ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE 1980'S

ROBERT O. WEISS

Forensics is manifestly a valuable and worthwhile educational endeavor. This statement constituting for our purposes an established truth, the decade of the 1980's might well be the time for forensics to "go public," to improve not only its public image, but also the public service of which it is capable. In order to reestablish itself in the public realm, forensics will, in the first instance, need to become visible enough so that what is being done in the field is open to scrutiny and, one would hope, to approval and appreciation. In the second place, it must increase substantially its sensitivity to the needs and expectations of its various constituencies.

For one thing, the field may find it absolutely necessary, not merely desirable, to give a good account of itself. "Accountability," which has become a watchword at all levels of education, requires that any activity be able to justify itself openly in terms of results, and no more than any other academic enterprise can forensics stay hidden from sight or merely say "trust me" to those whom it is presumed to serve. The 1980's will be a good time to be especially accountable.

The foremost accountability for forensics is to the institution which supports it. The school, especially if it is under pressure from accountability forces, will of course be looking for the quantified data which forensics can easily provide regarding the number and type of students served, events sponsored and participated in, faculty and staff commitments, and how the money was spent. Where measured outcomes are stressed, forensics will also find it wise to increase its attention to procedures for measuring and reporting publicly the effects of the activity upon those who take part.

Furthermore, being accountable to the institution which supports the program means being sure that what happens at a forensics tournament is defensible in terms of normal expectations about the nature of debate and individual events speaking. In a debate, for instance, normal expectations would probably include having the speakers talk explicitly about the topic set forth in the proposition, seeing the fundamental issues addressed, and finding the arguments comprehensible. The best test for coaches and judges to apply is this old standard: "Would I be proud to have my colleagues witness this event as an example of what I am trying to teach?"

One of the more embarrassing incidents in college debate a few years ago stemmed from the request for a copy of an NDT final round by a government official who was interested in wage and price controls and who had to be told that the debate in question was only peripherally related to the announced subject.[1] This happened mainly because debate

---

Robert O. Weiss is Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences and Director of Forensics at DePauw University.

[1] Stan Rives, "More About Squirrels," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 9 (Summer 1972), p. 291. The debate itself was marked by this presumably ironic negative dismissal of the topicality issue, "I've been debating a lot of cases this year, and I would like to say that this is the only one that is clearly in the spirit of the resolution, and I would like to congratulate the gentlemen from UCLA for finally debating the topic." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 8 (Summer 1971), p. 15.

had become too cloistered for its own good. In other instances, expectations have been violated by debates which were superficial and by speaking performances no more than exhibitionistic. Going public will mean that outsiders will be able to introduce judgments on these things. An additional advantage will be that really good debates and speeches, which now too often bloom unseen, will in the 1980's have a broader exposure.

Not only must forensics be accountable to those who support it institutionally, but it also has a direct responsibility to the student participants themselves. Since the basic principle that the education of students is its foremost objective is generally agreed upon in forensics, the 1980's may well be a period for reinforcing that principle. There has been a perennial danger of putting the system first, of setting up a program and then recruiting, cajoling, impressing and paying students to take part in it. Directors are tempted to feed the habit of octoholic debaters who are hooked on the hope of getting higher, so to speak, in the elimination rounds, or to exploit the individual events contestants who are so trophytropic that they don't know when to quit. On the one hand, recruiting and publicizing the values of forensics will always be a vital necessity, and coaches indeed do many students a great personal favor by encouraging them to participate; but on the other hand there are participants who should be required to vary the events they enter or even to do something else beside forensics.

To bring about the needed accountability, the most useful step will be letting more fresh air into both debate and individual events tournaments. Inviting audiences to attend, requiring speech communication classes to be there, even merely going back to using timekeepers, may be helpful if directors and debaters will pay attention to what the listeners say afterward. Colleagues in communication and in other fields, whether or not they are judging, are willing to provide critiques of the cogency and saliency of arguments. Furthermore, going public should mean that forensics events, especially at the championship or "prestige" level, should be judged increasingly by those whose credentials are firmly established through a substantial background of experience in public life or, at the very least, in the forensics community. One additional practice, that of publishing the text and critiques of the NDT finals and of other major events (e.g., the *Winning Orations* of the Interstate Oratorical Association), has already proven to be an exceptionally helpful safeguard for public responsibility in forensics.[2]

Accountability to the whole student body of an institution means reaching out to find ways in which all students can participate, ways in which debate and other speech activities can contribute to the intellectual and social excitement of campus life. The forensics program deals with ideas and controversy, two of the staples of an academic community. Debaters can argue about issues like intermediate grades and coed housing, which are of concern and interest to the immediate campus, as well as other public issues which come to the center of attention from time to time, such as whether women should be drafted or solar energy developed. They may even help student philosophers consider whether existence is prior to essence.

Having met a responsibility in this way on the campus, forensics is in

---

[2] Footnote 1 would not have been possible without this practice.

a position to provide something of the same service for a broader community. When a public issue is important, speakers who have been trained to search for the best evidence, to locate the central issues, and to produce appropriate counter responses, as well as to communicate effectively, can set forth these issues for community audiences and groups in ways which will facilitate rational public attitude formation and decision making. Persuasive speakers who are committed to a cause or have personal experiences which are compelling can provide new viewpoints and feelings to other than contest judges. Students who have developed dramatic readings bring literature to a wider audience and enrich lives that way, giving effectiveness to the literature and not just to the performer.

Another way in which forensics seems ready to go public is in the publication of theories which emerge from the activity. Thus, the practices which have been invented in a laboratory-like environment may be tested through publication in a wider forum, and their applicability to the processes of public communication and decision making may be further evaluated. As these theories are brought forth systematically in forensics publications, and all of the forensics journals seem to be headed in that direction, those that meet the test of academic scrutiny and challenge may continue on into the mainstream of rhetorical theory.

It should be noted that responsiveness to the demands of accountability should in no way mean abandoning confidence and integrity in the field. Certainly, many student performances are training exercises to be judged by the educational effects they produce and not by public standards which they are not yet ready to meet. In addition, no forensics program should allow itself to be at the mercy of demands, such as those which big-time athletics faces, for results determined by superficial measures such as won and loss records. Nor should any forensics program be forced into the impossible situation of addressing its justifications to "enemy agents" who simply want to divert budgets and faculty positions to their own esoteric projects. With confidence and integrity, the thing to look for in the 1980's will be a set of activities based upon a sound and defensible rationale and resulting in genuine educational experiences designed to meet the needs of institutions, students, and society as a whole.

Going public means that what forensics is doing well will be out in the open for all to benefit from and enjoy and that what it is not doing so well will be changed in the light of public scrutiny. This program constitutes both our expectation and our recommendation for the 1980's.

INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS IN THE 1980'S: A BRIEF LOOK INTO A MURKY CRYSTAL BALL

TENNYSON WILLIAMS

Given my reluctance to describe intercollegiate forensics in the 1970's, it should come as no surprise that I am even more reluctant to predict the future. The only prediction for which I will be willing to be held accountable is that most of the predictions we hear about intercollegiate forensics in the '80's will not come true. Just as the '70's survived the dire predictions of many people, so will the '80's. Changes will occur but I suspect they will not be of the magnitude and perhaps not even in the direction we may predict.

As we enter the '80's we are, as usual, accompanied by prophets of doom. Some say that declining enrollment will be reflected in reduced travel budgets and fewer student participants. Rapidly increasing airline fares are said to foreshadow an end to the national circuit. In my more pessimistic moods I am inclined to agree that intercollegiate forensics faces a dim future; after all, declining enrollments and increasing airfares cannot be denied. However, in those periods when my crystal ball goes blank, I find myself testing those predictions with some of the tools of my profession, and I am less inclined to agree with them.

It seems far more likely to me that declining enrollments will mean the demise of many small liberal arts colleges rather than radically reduced enrollments at all colleges. The colleges which survive will be those which maintain standards of excellence, including active forensics programs. Empty dormitory rooms at larger state-supported universities may be inexpensive substitutes for motels for housing tournament participants. Cost-conscious directors of forensics may not travel to major national tournaments every weekend but, conscious also of the need for quality competition, they will be able to travel far on occasion. Yes, there is cause to foresee dark clouds in the '80's, but there is also cause to expect some rays of sunshine.

I fully expect critics of the National Debate Tournament to continue and perhaps to escalate their attacks on that not so venerable institution. There probably will be efforts within the American Forensic Association to decrease its support of the NDT; there may be attempts to abolish it entirely. There are times when I share the sentiments of NDT detractors, but I remain convinced that it serves a necessary purpose. Implicit within forensic competition is the notion that the primary standard for excellence is comparative. Debaters want—nay, need—to know who is best. If the NDT were abolished by the AFA, it would rise phoenix-like under the auspices of DSR-TKA or some less benign leadership. AFA members realize that the NDT or its successor will continue to set the pattern followed by other tournaments; that realization should make them want to retain some measure of influence over how the NDT is conducted. In any event, I think it is safe to predict that we will have the NDT to kick around throughout the '80's.

Tennyson Williams is Director of Intercollegiate Forensics at Macalester College.

As I noted in the article on the '70's, there has been an encouraging trend toward using argument to develop theory. My murky crystal ball reveals a continuation of that trend toward greater interaction between what is written in our professional journals and what is practiced among our students. It is quite possible that we may even begin to use tournament competition as not only the teaching laboratory of the '70's but also as a research laboratory of the '80's.

Having begun this fantastic voyage, I am tempted to go on to predict the abolition of rebuttal speeches, the 1989 superbowl matching CEDA and NDT champions, and nationally televised elimination rounds every Sunday afternoon. However, I just dropped my crystal ball and will have to leave such predictions to others who are more prescient than I.

FORENSICS IN THE EIGHTIES: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

DAVID ZAREFSKY

In large part, the nature of forensics in the 1980's will be influenced by the traditions of earlier years. In part, too, the future will be governed by forces not now foreseen. Hence it would be folly to pretend to offer definitive speculations about what is to come. Nevertheless, it is not hard to discern pressures and trends which undoubtedly will be important in determining the shape of our field over the next decade. In this essay, I wish to focus on three such events: economic pressures, declining enrollments, and competing demands for student and faculty interest and time. Recognition of these forces, and creative imagination in responding to them, may leave forensics in a far stronger position than it now enjoys. On the other hand, indifference to the pressures or a laissez faire approach to them will make forensics vulnerable to calls for retrenchment or elimination of expensive programs.

Economic Pressures

It is a commonplace to assert that the 1960's were boom years for education. As children of the postwar "baby boom" reached adolescence and adulthood, expanded educational programs and opportunities were needed, and significant infusions of government funds made them possible. Since an expanding economy caused tax revenues to increase, spending more money on education was politically painless. And the relative price stability during the decade meant that schools could make real gains at relatively small cost.

How distant, how otherworldly, this whole scenario seems! The dominant fact of our economic life for the past several years has been approximately a ten percent annual rate of inflation. Far worse than general inflation has been the much higher rate of price increases for energy. Airplane fares, for example, have increased by more than 50% over the past few years; the cost of gasoline is now double what it was in far-off 1978. Food prices likewise have increased faster than overall inflation, and room rates for hotels and motels have not lagged far behind. It seems the better part of realism to recognize that these increases are likely to continue.

Many sectors of society have been "indexed" for inflation, either formally or informally, but forensics budgets are not among them. Like the elderly, a forensics program survives on a "fixed income." Budgets that may have been adequate to support a broad-based program as recently as three years ago now find themselves ravaged by persistent inflation. Forensics directors usually are skilled advocates and in many cases have succeeded in gaining approval for budget increases (though seldom keeping pace with inflation). In the future, however, directors' efforts to secure compensatory budget increases seem less likely to succeed because of inflation's impact on public services in general.

David Zarefsky is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern University. He was Director of Forensics at Northwestern from 1970 to 1975.

As individuals find themselves financially strapped, one way seemingly to ease their burdens is through tax relief. The "anti-government" ethos which is now popular certainly would justify shifts of resources from the public to the private sector. As a response to tax-relief pressures, or in the hopes of forestalling them, state legislatures have imposed budget economies. These often are imposed on all state institutions with the local campus officials given discretion as to where to make the cuts. Their decisions are made harder because many budget items are uncontrollable—utility costs, labor costs for workers under union contracts, and so on. In searching for programs which could be cut by a local institution to effect the needed savings, forensics offers an inviting target. It is relatively small, so no powerful constituency on campus is likely to be offended. It appears to be expensive per student, so great savings could be achieved by scaling down or abolishing the program. And the laments over the sad state of modern debate which have appeared over the years in this journal and elsewhere could provide the pretext for clothing a budgetary decision in academic garb.

Although I write of public colleges and universities, I should make plain that the same pressures will apply to private institutions as well. Instead of legislative action as the impetus, concern over what the tuition market will bear, and about the growing discrepancy in cost between public and private schools, will lead an institution to increase its tuition by less than the overall rate of inflation. Since it usually is not very meaningful to think of "productivity" gains in academe, the institution then must make internal cutbacks or realignments in order to achieve the needed savings to balance its budget.

Even if these drastic scenarios do not play out, schools with relatively *stable* budgets will find themselves in much the same predicament. Each year it is possible to do less and less, so the program is faced with self-imposed contractions. Attrition rather than the budget-cutter's ax produces approximately the same result. At some point, the forensics director or the administration may decide that continuing the program is not worth it. I fear that many currently viable programs, if left to their own devices, may face this sort of slow death.

The signs are already about us. Tournaments are smaller; there are fewer of them; a given school will attend fewer of them and send fewer teams to those which it enters. These trends, in my opinion, do not signify merely shifting tastes; they are adjustments made necessary by fiscal emergency. So far, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no organized response by the forensics community to these problems. As a point of pride, individual directors are doing what they can to assure that their tournaments will be among the last to go. Curtailment or elimination of others' programs is greeted with little more than collective hand-wringing. But an individualist strategy of response is likely to hurt *everyone* in the long run. It will produce a great disparity between a few large, well-supported, "powerhouse" programs and a great mass of virtually inert ones. Such a situation will not help that great mass of programs. Nor will it help the "powerhouses." Without places to send beginning or intermediate-level students to competition, they will erode from the foundation. Without the prestige resulting from distinction in an activity in which a wide range of schools participate, they may lose support from the top. *Any* forensics program has an interest in the health of *all* programs, and yet reliance on market forces and individual decisions may produce a circumstance which is to the detriment of all.

We need to combine our energies and talents to figure out, as a community, how to maintain strong programs in the face of unrelenting inflation. The answers may involve modifications in what we now do, such as agreeing to shorten the season (so that the remaining opportunities for competition are stronger rather than *all* opportunities being a bit weaker), scheduling contests to take more advantage of "swings," or taking more advantage of airline deregulation to search out discount fares. Other responses might involve rethinking the structure of current programs. Perhaps we can find uses of communications technology which minimize the need for travel. Perhaps we can redesign the tournament to do on a larger scale what it did in the Depression years: providing more competitive opportunities at lower cost. Perhaps we can make more use of public forums, speakers' brueaus, and consultation with business and industry, not as alternatives to tournament competition but as additional sources of revenue.

Whether these issues can best be addressed by a special committee of the American Forensic Association, by the leadership of the various forensic organizations, by another National Developmental Conference, or by voluntary action of groups of forensics teachers and coaches, is a question I leave to others. My conviction is that the issues must be addressed by the community as a whole. No program can go it alone, and "rugged individualism" is likely to produce results which would be to our universal disadvantage.

Declining Enrollments

All readers of this journal are familiar with the demographic projections of decline in the number of high school and college-age youth throughout the 1980's. Those who live in or near the major urban centers of the Northeast and Midwest already have experienced the impact of this problem at first hand, as elementary schools and now high schools have closed their doors. As enrollment declines extend upward to the college level, we are likely to witness more aggressive competition for students, smaller enrollments, and in some cases the demise of whole institutions. Only in those regions now prospering from in-migration can we expect to see much birth or expansion of programs, and even there the gains may be short-lived.

Contraction of the student population threatens forensics in several ways. The most obvious, of course, is the closing of a school with an active program, since that means that there is one fewer strong program. But the other effects may be even more serious. In most if not all states, funds available to high school districts are dependent in part on enrollment. A drop in enrollment means a drop in state aid. Unfortunately, however, operating costs do not decline commensurately with enrollment. Some costs are fixed; some increase uncontrollably as the result of inflation. It's not uncommon, therefore, to find school districts wrestling with the problem of where to make program cuts to offset the loss in state aid. Determining what to cut is often a political decision, although clothed in a rhetoric of "basics," "fundamentals," and educational priorities. By this reasoning, extracurricular programs would be the first to go, and among those programs, activities which have a small and often not vocal constituency in the community would make the easiest targets. In probably the majority of American high schools, debate and forensic activities remain purely extracurricular. Despite our conviction that forensics is truly at the *heart*

of a good liberal arts education, the activity appears to many as a "frill," and—albeit valuable—an expensive one at that.

Even where forensics programs have a curricular base, we have not fully succeeded in convincing school administrators of the wisdom of conceiving of speech communication as a basic, fundamental skill. It is more likely to be viewed in the same category with dance, art, music, drama, and advanced study of foreign languages: commendable activities, and nice when we can afford them, but not the essentials of education. In most high schools, speech remains an adjunct of the English Department which could be pruned if necessary as a budgetary measure. When forensics loses its base in the curriculum, not only does it lose a natural source of students but it is forced to exist as an extracurricular organization subject to the vicissitudes noted above.

School districts with declining enrollments will experience reductions in the teaching force, usually on the basis of lowest seniority rather than merit or even specialized abilities and talents. Because of the unusual time and energy demands involved in forensics coaching, there is more turnover among coaches than among teachers in general. When cuts are made, coaches may find themselves at the bottom of the fabled seniority ladder. The loss of a coach may mean the loss of a program, or it may mean the reassignment of the program to a teacher who had a speech course once in college but is neither knowledgeable of, nor committed to, forensics, and who accepts the assignment under duress. Such assignments may placate concerned parents or salve the conscience of administrators in the short run, but they seldom augur well for the long-term survival and health of a program.

Some might argue that intercollegiate forensics might not be harmed by these developments at the high school level. It might even be suggested that college programs could gain by getting debaters who are fresh, not "burned out" by an intense high-school experience, and not encumbered by loyalty to an old high-school coach. To me, such a view is fundamentally mistaken. First, high school programs supply many of the students who become involved in intercollegiate forensics. Were high school programs not available and the students to develop other interests instead, who is to say that they would be receptive to forensics when they arrived at the collegiate level? Second, while intercollegiate forensics is and always should be available to those with no previous experience, our theory and practice have been allowed to become far more sophisticated by virtue of the fact that many students will have a good working knowledge of the basics so that we can begin on the basis of *assumed* knowledge. And, third, the demographic trends described here will not cease at the high school level. What happens to our colleagues may be a dress rehearsal for what happens to us.

Again, except for individually improvised measures to deal with this problem, we seem as a community not to have faced up to its dimensions. And individual approaches are less likely to be successful if not buttressed by professional norms. We need to be thinking about short courses and continuing education programs for the teacher suddenly thrust into the responsibility of the forensics program. We need to find more ways to harness the energies of college debaters in working with high school students, without sacrificing the leadership and direction that can come best from a professional teacher or coach. We need to investigate the consolidation of activity programs within school districts. We must search for ways to make institutes, workshops, and clinics even more useful to high-school

programs which may be without professional direction. We need more and better texts and curriculum guides for the high school level, more seminars and workshops on coaching techniques. We need individually and collectively to lobby for the increased recognition of speech communication as an academic discipline, and to argue for the centrality of forensics to the educational mission. We need to enlist our alumni, many of whom are in positions of influence, to lend their voices more publicly in support of forensics programs which may be in jeopardy.

Although no mechanism ever is perfect, it seems to me that we have in place at least *some* of the organizational structure to address these issues. I refer to the High School Affairs Committee and the Educational Practices Committee of the American Forensic Association. I believe much good could be accomplished if the charges to these committees were reformulated so that, together with other interested people and groups, they addressed themselves to these developmental issues rather than trying primarily to draft a new code of ethics or to police the use of evidence in the National Debate Tournament.

Competing Demands

I wish finally to focus on competing pressures perceived by students and coaches. Although it is an overgeneralization, it seems that today's students are far more apolitical than were those of a decade ago. There is less interest among them in public affairs, less knowledge in depth about public issues, and less attention to the public consequences of individual choice and conduct. Instead, the dominant orientation seems to be toward personal and career development. This "privatization" of the student body offers several threats to forensics. First, the public issues about which we debate seem remote and uninteresting to many students, making it harder for us to attract participants. Second, some who do participate in high school may abandon the activity in college, not so much because they don't like it any more as because they feel compelled to diversify their personal portfolios by acquiring other skills and experience. And, third, those who stick with the activity may approach debate topics with less understanding of their political and philosophical foundations, with the result that technical issues related to means will be discussed extensively and only scant attention will be given to more fundamental questions involving ends.

It is hard to know how to respond to these challenges. Certainly, forensics should not abandon its long-standing concern with public advocacy. Part of the answer may be to encourage the continued development of individual events, which—compared to debate—seem to *depend* less on a public emphasis. Part of the answer may be to consider some debate topics which lie at the junction of public policy and individual life-style. Part of it may be to recruit more vigorously with the sorts of testimonials we all could obtain from our alumni. But, at the base, we need to defend more actively the need for students to learn about significant public quesions and the value of participating in forensics as a means to that goal. We need more overt counter-messages which frankly defend the need to know about public policy.

As for coaches, they face strong competing pressures on their time. In most cases, their teaching loads are not reduced to reflect the full amount of time they spend on forensics—nor could they be. At more and more schools, the forensics director is expected to be a fully contributing faculty member active in research and scholarship—and this expectation is

healthy, both to inspire the research we need in our own field and to make clear to our colleagues that those in forensics deserve the same status and intellectual respect as they do. For most of us, programs are understaffed and budgets constantly in jeopardy. Teaching, scholarship, and administrative duties all constitute cross-pressures affecting our ability to coach and manage a forensics program. Since these cross-pressures are unlikely to dissipate, we must learn to manage them better, so that the day-to-day duties of directing a program do not drive out our other professional commitments and needs. We need to manage our own time, taking care to set aside blocks of time for research and writing. We need to manage the length and pace of the competitive season so that the whirl of tournament travel does not leave us exhausted and overwhelmed. When we do not have adequate staff, we must be hesitant about making up for the shortage by throwing *ourselves* even more fully into coaching and travel, to the neglect of our other duties. If we are to be true to all the needs of our profession, then we must keep those needs in careful perspective.

We also must make our professional organizations more efficient, so that the time we devote to organizational responsibilities is no greater than it needs to be for the good of the profession. I seriously wonder whether we need every last one of the following organizations: the SCA Forensics Division, the American Forensic Association with its structure of committees and its regional subsidiaries, the National Forensic Association, three separate forensic honorary societies, the National Forensic League, the National Catholic Forensic League, the Cross-Examination Debate Association, and regional and state leagues too numerous to list. Such a plethora of organizations, in my view, harms us more than it helps. It fragments our loyalties and our energies, and it causes us to spend more time than we need on housekeeping, business meetings, committee assignments, and administrative detail. Some of each of these things is essential, but I find our current balance not very healthy. Perhaps during the 1980's we will take steps to consolidate some organizations, to streamline functions and procedures, and really to consider whether we need all the groups and activities we've allowed to develop over the years. Surely we can get "more bang for the buck" as far as our organizational commitments go, so that more of our time would be available to respond to other competing needs.

Conclusion

I have tried to suggest three major challenges which I think confront forensics in the 1980's—economic forces, demographic trends, and the competing pressures which students and coaches face. How we will respond to these challenges is by no means a foregone conclusion. We can ignore them, so that they work their will on our activity capriciously. We can resist them, or regard them as matters for individual attention only. Or we can try to anticipate them, acting instead of only reacting, bringing the combined intelligence and imagination of the forensic community to bear on a set of problems that affect us all.